GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

CALL NO. 891.22 C-Bha-Pus

D.G.A. 79.

AMRIT BOOKS & STATIONERY

BHĀSA—A STUDY

MEHAR CHAND LACHHMAN DAS
Sanskrit and Prakrit Series

VOLUME SEVEN

Price Rs. 15

PUBLISHERS

MEHAR CHAND LACHHMAN DAS
Sanskrit Book Depot, Saidmitha Bazar,
LAHORE.

First Edition] *May, 1940* [*1000 Copies*

BHĀSA—A STUDY

BY

A. D. PUSALKER, M. A., LL. B.,

V. N. Mandlik Gold-Medalist, and Pandit Bhagvanlal Indraji Prizeman of the Bombay University; M. R. Jayakar Prizeman in Pūrvamīmāṁsā; Lecturer, Bhāratiya Vidyā Bhavan, Andheri, Bombay.

8492

WITH A FOREWORD BY

DR. A. BERRIEDALE KEITH, D. C. L., D. LITT.,

Regius Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology, University of Edinburgh.

891.22
C/ Bha/Pus

PUBLISHED BY

MEHAR CHAND LACHHMAN DAS

Prop. The Sanskrit Book Depot,
Oriental & Foreign Booksellers & Publishers,
Jain Street, Saidmitha Bazar, LAHORE.

1940

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.
Acc. No. 8492
Date 13.2.57
Call No. 891.22
Abdul Pus

Printed by L. Khazanchi Ram Jain, at the
Manohar Electric Press, Jain Street, Lahore.

FOREWORD.

The controversy over the Trivandrum plays ascribed by their editor to Bhāsa has been carried on with much vivacity for years, and there seems to be but slight chance of the protagonists on either side convincing their opponents. Nor is this surprising. The evidence, internal and external alike, is capable of varying interpretation, and the result in the last resort probably comes to depend on the æsthetic value of the plays in the view of the disputants. The most that can be done, unless and until fresh manuscript evidence comes to light, is that which is undertaken by Mr A. D. Pusalker, a detailed and careful survey in a critical spirit of the contentions which have been adduced, and an effort to arrive at a result which shall represent the conclusion which on the evidence available can most reasonably be drawn. In the first two chapters of his study the author gives us a reasoned case for the view that the Trivandrum plays come from one and the same hand, and that the hand was that of Bhāsa. He has stated the counter-case fully and fairly, and he has avoided acceptance as conclusive of arguments which are merely specious. Moreover, he has remembered the duty of treating with courtesy views which he does not share, and it may be hoped that his example in this regard may be followed in subsequent investigations.

Mr. Pusalker's view on the date of Bhāsa as the author of the plays is hardly likely to win early acceptance. Those who assign him to the pre-Mauryan period have many difficulties to face, which the author does not seem to me to have surmounted, nor is he convincing in his assertion that Kālidāsa is to be restored to the first century B. C. and Aśvaghoṣa is to be made out his successor.

There are interesting discussions of the sources of the plays, of the verses ascribed in the anthologies to Bhāsa which afford scholars ample room for the exercise of the constructive imagination, and of their chronological order. The relations of the *Cārudatta* and the *Mṛcchakaṭika* are investigated with care and judgment, while those who are mainly interested in the plays as literature will find much that is stimulating and suggestive in the elaborate analysis and criticism of each play.

A useful and laborious study of the sociological conditions of the period brings together a large number of interesting facts. Mr Pusalker has drawn upon the *Arthaśāstra* as a parallel source, for he regards Bhāsa as a contemporary of Kauṭilya, though his senior, and those of us who reject tradition and place the *Arthaśāstra* some centuries after the Christian era will be glad to have a comparison between the works no less than those who place the *Arthaśāstra* under Candragupta Maurya. On the whole result of comparison is negative rather than positive; of general agreement there is abundance, of concurrence in significant detail little or nothing.

The bibliography, the collection of Subhāṣitas from Bhāsa, and the lists of anthology verses, which may be his, are certain to prove very useful, and, whatever doubts may be felt on aspects of the author's work, there can be no doubt that it will serve as a useful foundation for further advance in the elucidation of the many problems with which he deals with wide knowledge and often with sound critical judgment.

A. Berriedale Keith

In Memoriam

MY MOTHER

PREFACE

It was in the year 1925 when the University of Bombay had prescribed Śūdraka's Mṛcchakaṭika *as one of the Texts in Sanskrit for the Intermediate Examination in Arts that I was first attracted to the Bhāsa Problem on account of the close relationship between the* Cārudatta *and the* Mṛcchakaṭika. *My studies received an added impetus and were continued in a systematic form since 1932, when the University of Bombay announced "A Critical Study of the Works of Bhāsa" as the subject for the much coveted Mandlik Gold Medal.*

I made a preliminary survey of the vast material that had gathered round the problem, and in order to ascertain the recent opinions of eminent orientalists who had contributed articles on the Problem, I addressed a number of communications. The response, however, was quite discouraging. But it was a matter of great joy and satisfaction to me to have read the recent views from Doctors Winternitz, Keith, Konow, Lévi, Sukthankar and others. Owing to restrictions of time and the number of pages, the scope of that essay was necessarily restricted.

The award of the Medal was made in my favour in 1933, and, in accordance with the desire of the Chairman of the Editorial Board of the Journal of the University of Bombay, I prepared a summary of my thesis for the Journal which appeared in 1934 in the second volume of the said Journal on pp. 174-202. I sent off-prints of the article to many distinguished Sanskritists, and received encouraging and favourable reviews from Doctors Vidhusekhara Bhattacharya, De, Keith, Konow, Morgenstierne, Sukthankar, Weller, Winternitz, Professors Dikshitar, K. H. Dhruva, Kane, K. Rama Pisharoti, and

others. Dr. Sukthankar, Prof. Dikshitar and Diwan Bahadur Prof. Dhruva suggested that I should pursue the subject in all its aspects and bring out the result in book form. I began the work in 1935 and am glad now to place before the public the result of my labours. The difference in the scope and treatment of the subject as well as the amount of the new material used in my Gold Medal Essay and the present book would be evident even from the number of pages covered by both: whereas the Essay did not exceed 120 typed sheets, the typescript of the latter has run to nearly 800 sheets.

The book has been divided into two parts, the first dealing with 'The Bhāsa Problem and Thirteen Bhāsa Plays', and the second with 'The Sociological Conditions of the Period'. In view of the Table of Contents appended to this volume it is not necessary for me to cover the same ground here. In the first three chapters of the book, I have exhaustively dealt with the Bhāsa Problem with the aid of all the available material, giving views of scholars and adding my comments wherever necessary. I have tried to prove in these chapters the common authorship of these plays, the authorship of Bhāsa, and the pre-Mauryan date of Bhāsa. In the next two chapters entitled 'Critical Study', the plays have been viewed from various aspects such as, Text Material; Sources; Characterization; Nāndī; Bharatavākya; *Defects; Personal History and other Works of Bhāsa; Anthology Verses; Chronological Order; Prakrit;* Nāṭyaśāstra; *Tragic Sense; Magic; Stage; Metrics; Bhāsa's Influence; etc., and mostly original views have been given. Then follows 'Relation between* Cārudatta *and* Mṛcchakaṭika' *where the problem is considered from various aspects. 'Authorship of the* Mṛcchakaṭika' *is incidentally referred to, and the untenability of the view that both are recensions of the same play has been proved, especially on account of the essential differences between the two plays; and finally, contrary views have been refuted. The last two chapters of the first book are devoted to 'The Thirteen Bhāsa Plays', 'Origin of Indian Drama' and 'Types of Sanskrit Drama' serve as introductory sections. Every play is, then, considered under 'Title', 'Plot', 'Deviation from Original Sources', 'Type of Drama',* 'Rasas *and* Alaṁkāras', *and 'Critical Remarks'. As the English*

Translations of the Plays were not readily available to me, I had to prepare a hurried abstract of each Play for its 'Plot'. In addition to the treatment of the Plays in the earlier chapters, 'Critical Remarks' in these chapters cover all ground, and do full justice to the previous writers. The Second Book is the most original part of the whole work. In the ninth chapter entitled 'Introductory', I have given the plan followed, which, briefly stated, is that in all subsequent chapters historical development of every sociological topic or problem is considered from the earliest times to the period of Bhāsa. The Ṛgveda *supplies the earlier limit ; then gradually come in their chronological order, the younger* Vedas, *the Indus Civilization, the* Brāhmaṇas *and* Vedāṅgas, *the Epics, the* Jātakas, *the* Arthaśāstra *and the works of Bhāsa. In the eleven chapters devoted to sociological conditions, I have dealt with every conceivable topic about which Bhāsa's works supplied any material. There are five Appendices to the book. The first contains complete 'Bibliography of Bhāsa'. In deference to Dr. Sukthankar's desire I have omitted the list of books and articles consulted and referred to, which had no direct bearing on the Bhāsa Problem, as it was thought unnecessary to include it. In Appendix II are given all the* 'Subhāṣitas *from Bhāsa's Plays' in an alphabetical order. 'Anthology Verses and Verses ascribed to Bhāsa' have been quoted in Appendix III and 'Split-up Verses in Bhāsa's Plays' form Appendix IV. The last Appendix contains 'References to Bhāsa and his Works'.*

Now I turn to the pleasant task of acknowledging my gratitude. I have indicated in the footnotes and in the body of the text my indebtedness to the fore-runners in the field. In fact, the footnotes have been rather bulky. I have purposely done that in order to save myself from the charge of plagiarism. I may mention this as a matter of fact that I have referred in footnotes to parallel statements even when I came across the articles after my text was written.

I am specially glad to offer my homage to my guru, *Dr. V. S. Sukthankar of the Bhandarkar Institute, Poona, who, in spite of his immense pre-occupations, always found time to meet me. Not only did he respond to my occasional correspondence, but he went through the whole typed MS. of this book. As the work was complete when it reached*

his hands, no drastic changes could be introduced ; but I have profited by his valuable suggestions. The time spent in his company at the Institute was very fruitful, and was always full of guidance and sound advice, which will ever be of use to me.

Equally helpful almost from the beginning was Dr. A. Berriedale Keith of the Edinburgh University, whom I first approached by letter in 1932 in connection with Bhāsa. Dr. Keith has always been kind and courteous to me, replying to my correspondence concerning other subjects as well. Among his multifarious activities relating to such diverse subjects as Indology and Constitutional Law, Dr. Keith spared time for going carefully through the whole MS. He has put me under deep obligation by readily acceding to my request of writing a 'Foreword' to this book.

Dr. Winternitz, Dr. Lévi, Diwan Bahadur Prof. K. H. Dhruva, Mr. K. G. Sesha Aiyar, Dr. B. Bhattacharya, Dr. Sten Konow, Dr. N. N. Law, Dr. C. K. Raja, Dr. L. Sarup, Dr. H. Weller, Prof. H. B. Bhide, Prof. C. R. Devadhar, Prof. V. R. R. Dikshitar, Prof. P. V. Kane, Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti, Mr. K. G. Sankar and Mr. K. L. Soman (Kirāta) obliged me by replying to my queries concerning Bhāsa. I am specially indebted to the late Dr. Winternitz, Dr. E. H. Johnston, and Professors Dikshitar, Hariyappa, Jahagirdar, Krishna Rao, Ramachandra Rao, K. Rama Pisharoti and Shembavanekar for supplying me with off-prints of their articles. Though Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti and Dr. C. K. Raja held views diametrically opposed to mine regarding the Bhāsa Problem, they always responded to my correspondence in a true scholarly spirit, and did not fail to put forth their views before me. In spite of their arguments, however, I still firmly believe in Bhāsa's authorship of the group of plays, as also in the date I have assigned to him. I must make a special mention of 'Kirāta', the well-known Marathi play-wright, who was ever willing to give the benefit of his study of the Bhāsa Problem, and has formed such a cordial attachment for me. It is a pity that owing to loss of sight he is unable to follow literary pursuits. The talks that I had with Prof. P. K. Gode in the Bhandarkar Institute and at his residence were of much value and guidance to me as they

were the result of his mature experience. Once more I cordially thank all those whom Bhāsa drew towards me, and hope that they would keep up the same regard for me.

I must also record my obligations to the staff of the Imperial Library, Calcutta; the University Library, Bombay; the Bhandarkar Institute Library; the S. P. College Library, and the Kesari-Maratha Library, Poona, and the Bombay Royal Asiatic Society Library (during May 1932) whose willing and ready help saved me a lot of time and trouble. I have consulted in some form or other the works and articles referred to by me. The difficulty in procuring books may be imagined when I state that in spite of the above Libraries being at my disposal, there are half a dozen articles, notably from the Śārada *of Allahabad, which I could not come across.*

Finally, I take this opportunity of recording my thanks to the well-known firm of Oriental Publishers, Meharchand Lachhman Das, but for whose enterprise in the cause of Sanskrit learning, this book would not have seen the light of day. The firm has all along been kind and courteous, to me; and in spite of the impracticability of the final proofs passing before my eyes, they have accomplished the task quite creditably. For the few mistakes inevitable under such circumstances, I crave indulgence of the generous readers. I have invited attention in the 'Addenda et Corrigenda' to the important corrections only.

'Usha',
118, Shivaji Park,
Dadar, Bombay-14.

A. D. P.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

THE BHĀSA PROBLEM AND THIRTEEN BHĀSA PLAYS.

CHAPTER I.

Authorship of the Plays. 1

CHAPTER II.

Authorship of Bhāsa and Authenticity of the Trivandrum Plays. 23

CHAPTER III.

The Date of Bhāsa. 61

CHAPTER IV.

Critical Study. 82

CHAPTER V.

Chronological Order of the Plays. 118

CHAPTER VI.

Relation between Cārudatta and Mṛcchakaṭika. 150

CHAPTER VII.

Thirteen Bhāsa Plays. 175

CHAPTER VIII.

Thirteen Bhāsa Plays (Contd.) 229

BOOK II.

SOCIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS OF THE PERIOD AS REVEALED FROM THE WORKS OF BHĀSA.

CHAPTER IX.

Introductory. 315

CHAPTER X.
Geographical Knowledge. 322

CHAPTER XI.
Varṇāśramadharma. 350

CHAPTER XII.
Marriage Laws and Customs. 366

CHAPTER XIII.
Position of Women. 380

CHAPTER XIV.
Urban and Rural Life. 387

CHAPTER XV.
Court Life. 396

CHAPTER XVI.
Military Organization. 408

CHAPTER XVII.
Architecture, Sculpture and Art. 417

CHAPTER XVIII.
Religion, Philosophy, Literature and Sciences. 424

CHAPTER XIX.
Social Life. 436

CHAPTER XX.
Social Life : Public vices (Contd.) 456

APPENDIX I. Bibliography.
(A) Bhāsa's Plays : Texts and Translations. 1
(B) Books and Articles on the Bhāsa Problem. 5
APPENDIX II. • *Subhāṣitas* from Bhāsa's plays. 15
APPENDIX III. Anthology Verses ascribed to Bhāsa. 24
APPENDIX IV. Split-up verses. 26
APPENDIX V. References to Bhāsa and His Works. 28
INDEX. 38

ABBREVIATIONS.

ABI : Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.

ADC : All India Drama Conference, 1921, Bangalore, 1927.

AMV : Asutosh Memorial Volume, Patna, 1926-1928.

Anc. Geogr. : Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India. Calcutta, 1924.

AP : Aryan Path, Bombay.

Āścarya : Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi, Madras, 1926.

AUJ : Annamalai University Journal, Annamalainagar.

AUS : Allahabad University Studies.

BCV : Bhand. Com. Vol. (i. e. Commemorative Essays presented to Sir R. G. Bhandarkar). Poona, 1917.

BRRI : Bulletin of the Ramavarma Research Institute, Trichur.

BS : Bhāsa-Studien. By Max Lindenau. Leipzig, 1918.

BSGW : Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königl. Sächischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philol. histor. Klasse.

BSOS : Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London.

Carm. Lect. : Carmichael Lectures.

CHI : Cambridge History of India. Volume I, Ancient India, Cambridge, 1922.

Chronology : Chronology of Ancient India. By Sita Nath Pradhan. Calcutta, 1927.

CJ : Chitramayajagat (Marathi monthly Magazine) Poona.

COJ : Calcutta Oriental Journal, Calcutta.

Corporate Life : Corporate Life in Ancient India. By R. C. Majumdar. Poona, 1922.

CR : Calcutta Review, Calcutta.

Critical Study : Bhāsa's Works : A Critical Study. By MM. T. Ganapati Sastri. Trivandrum, 1925.

Criticism : Bhāsa's Works : A Criticism. By A. K. Pisharoti. Trivandrum, 1925.

Dv Abhi. Gr : Dvivedi Abhinandan Grantha.

EHD : Early History of the Deccan by R. G. Bhandarkar. Bombay, 1884.

EHI : Early History of India by Vincent Smith, 4th. Edition. Oxford, 1924.

EI : Epigraphica Indica.

Festgabe Garbe : Aus Indiens Kultur Festgabe Richard von Garbe. Erlangen, 1927.

Festgabe Jacobi : Beitrage zur Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte Indiens. Festgabe Hermann Jacobi zum, 75. Bonn, 1926.

Festschrift Kuhn : Aufsätze zur Kultur und Sprachgeschichte vornehmlich des Orients Ernst Kuhn.

Geog. Dict : Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India by Nandolal Dey, 2nd Edition. London, 1927.

Geog. Early Bud : Geography of Early Buddhism by B. C. Law. London, 1932.

GOS : Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Baroda.

HIL : History of Indian Literature (English translation) Volumes I and II. Calcutta, 1927 and 1932.

Hindu Adm. Inst : Hindu Administrative Institutions by V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar. Madras, 1929.

HOS : Harvard Oriental Series.

HR : Hindustan Review, Patna.

HSL : History of Sanskrit Literature.

IA : Indian Antiquary, Bombay.

IC : Indian Culture, Calcutta.

IHQ : Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.

Ind. Cult : Indian Culture through the Ages by S. V. Venkatesvara. 2 Vols. London, 1928 and 1932.

JA : Journal Asiatique, Paris.

JAHRS : Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society, Rajahmundry.

JAOS : Journal of the American Oriental Society, New Haven.

JASB : Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.

JASBom : Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay.

JBHU : Journal of the Benares Hindu University.

JBORS : Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Patna.

JBRAS : Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

JDL : Journal of the Department of Letters (Calcutta University).

JIH : Journal of Indian History, Madras.

JOR : Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.

JRAS : Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

JUB : Journal of the University of Bombay.

Kupp. Com. Vol : Kuppuswami Commemoration Volume. Madras, 1936.

MASI : Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India.

Mbh : Mahābhārata, Citrashala Edition, Poona.

MOS : Madras Oriental Series.

MR : Modern Review, Calcutta.

Mṛch : Mṛchakaṭika, Ed. by V. R. Nerurkar, Bombay, 1934.

MS : Mahārāṣtra Sāhitya (Marathi Monthly Magazine), Bombay.

NPP : Nāgari Pracāriṇi Patrikā (Hindi Quarterly), Benares.

OC : (I, II, etc.) Proceedings and transactions of the (1st, 2nd, etc.) All-India Oriental Conference.

Outline : Outline of Ancient Indian History and Civilization by R. C. Majumdar. Calcutta, 1927.

OZ : Ostasiatisch Zeitschrift. Leipzig and Berlin.

PB : Prabuddha Bhārata, Mayavati.

PCV : Pathak Commemoration Volume. Poona, 1934.

PHAI : Political History of Ancient India. By H. C. Ray Chaudhuri 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Editions. Calcutta, 1923, 1927 and 1932.

Plays etc. : Plays ascribed to Bhāsa : Their Authenticity and Merits. By C. R. Devadhar. Poona, 1927.

Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind. : Political History of Ancient India.

Problems : Some Problems of Indian Literature by M. Winternitz. Calcutta, 1925.

Pub. Adm. Public Administration in Ancient India by P. N. Banerjea. London, 1916.

QJMS : Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Bangalore.

Racial Synthesis : Racial Synthesis in Hindu Culture by S. V. Visvanatha. London, 1928.

Rāmāyaṇa : Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa edited by S. Kuppuswami Sastri and others. Madras, 1933.

Saḍukti : Saḍuktikarṇāmṛta.

Śārṅgadhara : Śārṅgadharapaddhati.

SB : Sanskrit Bhārati, Burdwan.

SD : Sanskrit Drama by A. B. Keith. Oxford, 1924.

Social Life : Social Life in Ancient India by H. C. Chakladar. Calcutta, 1929.

SSP : Sanskrit Sāhitya Pariṣad Patrikā, Calcutta.

Sūkti : Sūktimuktāvali.

TSS : Trivandrum Sanskrit Series.

Unmāda : Unmādavāsavadatta.

Upasaṃhāra : Mahābhāratāchā Upasaṃhāra. by C. V. Vaidya. Poona, (in Marathi).

Vicissitudes : The Vicissitudes of Aryan Civilization in India. By M. M. Kunte. Bombay, 1880.

Viṇā : Viṇāvāsavadatta.

Vision : Vision of Vāsavadattā by L. Sarup. Lahore, 1925.

VJV : Vividha Jñāna Vistāra (Marathi Monthly Magazine), Bombay.

VOJ : Vienna Oriental Journal, Vienna.

WZKM (VOJ) : Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morganlandes, Wien.

ZDMG : Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Leipzig.

ZII : Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik, Leipzig. Unless otherwise specifically mentioned, the references are to the first editions of the plays as published in the TSS in the case of the Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa (Pratijñā) Bālacarita (Bāl), Avimāraka (Avi), Dūtaghaṭotkaca (Dgh), Karṇabhāra (Karṇa), and Ūrubhaṅga (Ūru). Texts with commentaries by MM. Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri are used for the Pañcarātra (Pañc), 1917 Edition ; Madhyama Vyāyoga (Mv), 1917 Edition ; Cārudatta (Cār), 1922 Edition : Svapnavāsavadatta (Svapna), 1924 Edition ; Pratimā (Prat), 1924 Edition ; and Dūtavākya (Dv), 1925 Edition. Mr. V. Sarma's edition (Lahore, 1930) has been referred to for the Abhiṣeka (Abh).

CHAPTER I.

Authorship of the Plays.

The discovery and publication of the thirteen plays ascribed to Bhāsa in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series will go down to posterity as the most epoch-making landmark in the History of Sanskrit Drama. In spite of Dr. Raja's dissenting note[1], refusing to acknowledge the discovery, the event has everywhere been hailed with greatest delight, and rightly regarded as equal in importance to the discovery of the *Arthaśāstra*. The South has thus laid the world of Orientalists under an obligation once more, by delivering a casket of precious jewels, that was hitherto known only by mere name.

Much has been written in support as well as against the Bhāsa theory, and Dr. Charpentier regards the question as 'beyond discussion' against the authorship of Bhāsa.[2] Opinion is yet sharply divided and nothing like a definite solution of the problem seems to have been reached. Various Universities in India have included some of these Trivandrum plays in their course of studies as 'Works of Bhāsa', and the fact of there being numerous editions of the plays as also the number of critical studies and articles on the problem in many Indian and European languages testifies to the world-wide interest attracted by these plays. Messrs. Abhyankar, Asuri, Banerji Sastri, Baston, Belvalkar, Bhide, Dhruva, Dikshitar, Ghatak, Guleri, Sesha Iyer, Jacobi, Jayaswal, Jolly, Kale, Keith, Konow, Krishna Sastri, Lacôte, Lesný, Lindenau, Meerwarth, Morgenstierne, Paranjape, Pavloni, Printz, Ray, Sarup, Haraprasad Sastri, Harihar Sastri,

1 *ZII.* 2, pp. 250-51. 2 *JRAS.* 1927, p. 605.

Shireff, Suali, Sukthankar, Thomas, Weller, Winternitz, and others accept the theory of Bhāsa's authorship; while Messrs. Barnett, Bhattanatha Swami, Charpentier, Devdhar, Kane, Ramakrishna Kavi, A. K. Pisharoti, K. R. Pisharoti, C. K. Raja, K. G. Sankar, Ramavatara Sarma, Hiranand Sastri, Kuppuswami Sastri, Raddi Sastri, Sylvain Lévi, Woolner and others refuse to accept the theory and pronounce the Trivandrum plays as spurious. It does not matter much which of these parties has the majority; for, as stated by Dr. Winternitz, "in science truth is not found out by the majority of *votes* but by the majority of *arguments*."[1]

Discovery of the plays. In 1909, MM. T. Ganapati Sastri in his tour for search of Mss came across a palm leaf MS containing 105 leaves in Malayalam characters in the Manalikkara Matham, near Padmanabha Puram. The MS. was more than 300 years old, and was found to contain the following ten *rūpakas* and the fragment of one more *rūpaka*;—

Svapna, Pratijñā, Pañc, Cār, Dgh, Avi, Bāl, Mv, Karṇa, Ūru.

During subsequent tours, two more Nāṭakas viz. *Abh* and *Prat* and also other copies of these and the *rūpakas* already discovered were unearthed from private collections at Kailasa Puram, Haripad, Chengannur and Manganam and in the Palace Library. A complete copy of the fragmentary play was found at Puttiyal revealing its name as *Dv*. The subsequent manuscript of the *Svapna* mentioned its title as '*Svapnavāsavadattam*.' All these manuscripts were in Malayalam characters and over 300 years old.[2] On the testimony of Bāṇa and Rājaśekhara, the learned discoverer ascribed these dramas to Bhāsa, the predecessor of Kālidāsa and placed his researches before scholars in 1912 in his introduction to the *Svapna*. Almost simultaneously with the above discovery, the *Svapna* responded to the twang of the spade of an archaeologist, MM. R. Narsimhachar, head of the Arch. Deptt., Mysore State, in the archives of the Govt. Oriental Mss. Library at Madras. Dr. Vincent Smith's notice of this rare find acquainted the

1 *CR*, Dec. 1924, p. 330. 2 *Critical Study*, pp. 1, 18, 19; *Svapna*, Intr. pp. 1, 2, 4-5.

world of orientalists about the discovery of the works of Bhāsa before MM. T. Ganapati Sastri's researches were known[1].

Works of Bhāsa. In addition to the 13 Trivandrum plays already mentioned, Mr. Kavi ascribes the authorship of *Dāmaka and Traivikrama* to Bhāsa, Mr. S. Narayana Sastri adds *Ghaṭakarpara* to the list,[2] while Krishnamachariar mentions *Kiraṇāvali* and *Udātta Rāghava*;[3] tradition credits Bhāsa with having composed over twenty plays[4]. The claims of all these latter works to be ranked among the works of Bhās will be considered in a subsequent chapter. At presen we shall deal with the 13 plays published by Dr. Ganapat Sastri.

The plays have been variously grouped and classified.[5] Following Dr. Sarup we may group the plays according to their subject matter as under:

I. Udayana or historical Plays: *Svapna, Pratijñā.*

II. Fiction or original Plays: *Avi, Cār.*

III. Mahābhārata Plays: *Bāl, Dgh, Dv, Karṇa, Mv, Pañc, Ūru.*

IV. Rāmāyaṇa Plays: *Prat, Abh.*

These plays can be isolated from the classical Sanskrit dramas on account of their technique. The stage direction **नान्द्यन्ते ततः प्रविशति सूत्रधारः** precedes the benedictory stanza, and the prologue is called *sthāpanā;* in Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti and other classical dramatists, the stage direction *nāndyante* etc. follows the benedictory stanza or stanzas, and the prologue is termed *prastāvanā.*

South Indian Plays, e. g. the *Mattavilāsa, Kalyāṇasaugandhika, Tapatī Saṁvaraṇa, Subhadrā Dhanañjaya,* etc. and Southern MSS of the *Śākuntala, Nāgānanda, Vikramorvašīya* etc. on the other hand, display the same structural peculiarities. Some of these

---

1 Smith, *IA*, 40, pp. 87-89; *Mysore Arch. Report* for 1909-10, Para 116. 2 Kavi, *OC*, III, pp. 82-85. *Dāmaka*, Ed. V. Sarma, Lahore, 1926. *Traivikrama*, published in *Shama'o*, 4, pp. 213-222, edited and trans. by K. Rama Pisharoti. S. Narayana Sastri, *Priyadarśikā*, Intr., p. XXII. *Ghaṭakarpara*, Pub. Venkateshwar Press, Bombay, Samvat 1966 (1910 A. D.) 3 *Hist. Class. Sansk. Lit.*, p. 67. 4 *ADC*, Bangalore, 1927 p. 131; *Priyadarśikā*, Vanivilas Press, 1927, p. XXIII; *Lokašikṣana*, Poona, 5, 1917, p. 325. 5 Winternitz, *OZ*, Jg. IX, followed by Devdhar, *Plays etc*, p. 2; Lindenau, *BS*, p. 16; Hivargaonkar, Marathi translation, Vol. I, pp. 2-3; Jahagirdar, *IA*, 1931, pp. 42-44; Sarup, *Vision*, Intr., p. 10.

also employ the lines अये किन्नु खलु मयि विज्ञापनव्यग्रे शब्द इव श्रूयते etc. to introduce the play. But our plays can be distinguished on account of the complete absence of any mention of the name of the poet or the title of the work. It is this important particular which has been overlooked by many an enthusiastic critic that is responsible for ascribing a Southern origin for our plays.

Thus, these plays can be isolated from all other plays, Northern or Southern. As observed by Dr. Sarup, "they exhibit a family likeness and form a group by themselves".[1]

Before handling the question of the authorship of the group, it will have to be considered whether these plays are the works of one author or of different authors written at different periods.

Are These Plays The Work Of One Or Several Authors ? Nearly all the supporters of the Bhāsa theory and some of the antagonists believe in a common authorship of these plays. It would not be out of place here to note the views of some eminent scholars as to the authorship of the plays before we proceed with our investigation.

MM. Dr. Ganapati Sastri ascribes all the plays to one author; and so do Dr. Keith, Dr. Thomas, Dr. Sarup, Dr. Lindenau, Dr. Banerji Sastri, Prof. S. M. Paranjape and Prof. Devdhar.[2] Prof. Jahagirdar ascribes the *Svapna*, *Pratijñā* and *Pañc* to Bhāsa and classifies the remaining plays into two groups belonging to different periods.[3] Dr. Winternitz (in his earlier writings) and Dr. Sukthankar pronounce the *Svapna* and *Pratijñā* as coming from Bhāsa and opine that in the present state of our knowledge, the authorship of the remaining plays is still uncertain.[4] According to Dr. Sten Konow, 'it is

1 Vision, Intr, p. 10. 2 G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, p. 16; Keith, *HSL*, p. 12; also letter dated 16-3-32; Thomas, *JRAS*, 1922, pp. 80-81; Sarup, *HR*, 1927, p. 118; Vision, Intr., p. 20; letter dated 17-2-32; Lindenau, *BS*, I; Banerji Sastri, *JRAS*, 1921, p. 378; Paranjape, *Pratimā*, Intr, pp. V—VII; Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, pp. 19-20. Prof. Devdhar excludes *Cār*. Dr. Jayaswal, *JASB*, 1918, pp. 269-269, impliedly seems to have accepted common authorship as he deals with all the plays without any exception. 3 *Id*, 1931, pp. 43-44. 4 Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 143. In his '*Problems*' p. 129, also *CR*, Dec. 1924, p. 340, Dr. Winternitz stated that all the plays had one author; but in his letter dated 22-12-31, the learned Doctor stated his opinion as given above. Latterly, however, he seemed to have changed his opinion, as would appear from his letter to me in October 1936. In his recent article, unfortunately the last one on the subject, the late Dr. Winternitz expressed much doubt as to the common authorship of even the epic plays

possible that also the remaining plays belong to him' (i. e. Bhāsa).' Prof. Kane and Prof. Bhide who had accepted the common authorship, now doubt the correctness of their decision.[2] Dr. Weller enumerates under the common authorship the *Cār*, *Bāl*, and *Avi*, in addition to the *Svapna* and *Pratijñā*.[3] Prof. K. H. Dhruva, who had impliedly accepted the authorship of Bhāsa for all the plays, now rules the *Abh*, *Karṇa*, *Ūru*, *Dv*, and *Dgh* out of order as of different authorship.[4] Dr. Barnett says that the plays belong to different periods; so state also Messrs. Pisharotis.[5] Dr. Woolner seems to postulate different periods for different groups of these plays.[6] Dr. Johnston also finds a number of different groups.[7] There seems, however, to be a consensus of opinion as to the common authorship of the *Svapna* and *Pratijñā*.[8]

We shall proceed with our study of the common authorship or the opposite of these plays now, right from the beginning and this brings us to the consideration of

1. STRUCTURAL SIMILARITIES.

i. All the plays begin with the stage direction—*nāndyante* etc.

ii. Sūtradhāra recites only one *maṅgala śloka* (which is absent in the *Cār*). In the *Svapna*, *Pratijñā*, *Pañc* and *Prat*, the mechanical device of *Mudrālaṁkāra*, which introduces the names of the important dramatis personae of the play in the *maṅgala śloka*, is used.

---

in the group. The whole article (*BBRI*, 5, 1937, pp. 1–15) is full of scepticism. He was "no longer a believer in Bhāsa's authorship of these plays." ib, p. 73.

1 Letter dated 14-7-32. 2 Kane, *VJV*, 1920, pp. 97–102; Letter dated 11-6-32. Bhide, *Svapna*, Intr., p. 4; Postcard dated 16-10-31. 3 Letter dated 4-8-32. It is in Sanskrit, and the portion relevant for this note reads:

स्वप्नवासवदत्तं प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायणं च भासकृते नाटके, परं तु कालेन विकारं प्राप्ते। चारुदत्तं बालचरितं चाविमारकमपि प्रायो भासनाटकानि भवेयुः। अवशिष्टानां विषये तु महती संशीतिरस्माकम्।

4 *Svapnani Sundari*, Ahm, 1928, Intr. pp. 22–25; Contra, *Pratimā*, Ahm, 1931, Intr. p. 19 N. 29; and letter dated 23-6-32; and *Thakkar Vasanji Lectures*, p. 205, N. 18. 5 Barnett, *BSOS*, 3, 521; Pisharoti, *A Criticism*, p. 23; *BSOS*, 3, pp. 107–117. 6 *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Vol. I. preface, pp. VI–VIII. 7 *IA*, 1933, pp. 95–99. 8 We believed in structural similarities of these plays when we originally wrote these lines before five years. Non-mention of the anonymity of these plays as one of the characteristics of Bhāsa's works noted by Bāṇa in the well known verse सूत्रधारकृतारम्भैः etc leads us to think that the prologue of these plays is badly tampered with after Bāṇa's time, though it seems only the portion containing the name of the author and the work was lost. It may perhaps be that some peculiarities such as the introductory stanzas containing *Mudrālamkāra*, etc. may be due to uniformity of process of some Kerala school which staged these dramas. We have, however, embodied the above section wholesale without any change in the text, as we intend to draw the attention of the readers to the mechanical similarities.

iii. The prologue is called *sthāpana* instead of the usual classical term *prastāvanā*. Only the *Karṇa* employs the term *prastāvanā*.

iv. These prologues are very brief (excepting that in the *Cār*) and are silent as to the name of the author or the work. It is only towards the end of the play that we come across the name of the work.

v. The form एवमार्यमिश्रान् विज्ञापयामि । अये किन्नु खलु मयि विज्ञापनव्यग्रे शब्द इव श्रूयते । अङ्ग पश्यामि । is used in the *sthāpanā* of most of the plays. The *Pratijñā*, *Cār*, *Avi* and *Prat* use a different form.

vi. With slight variations the epilogues in nearly all the plays are identical, using the verse

इमां सागरपर्यन्तां हिमवद्विन्ध्यकुण्डलाम् ।
महीमेकातपत्राङ्कां राजसिंहः प्रशास्तु नः ॥

in one form or the other. The *Cār* and *Dgh* have no epilogues at all.

Close similarity in the above particulars leads one to infer the common authorship of all the plays.

Next, we shall consider the

2. AGREEMENT WITH REGARD TO TECHNIQUE.

1. All the plays "disregard the rules of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* in bringing scenes on the stage which will never occur in classical dramas."[1] Such are the (*i*) deaths on stage of Daśaratha in the *Prat* (Act II), Vālin in the *Abh* (Act I) and Duryodhana in the *Ūru*; (*ii*) Slaughter of Cāṇūra, Muṣṭika and Kaṁsa; and (*iii*) the violent struggle between Kṛṣṇa and Ariṣṭa ending in the death of the demon in the *Bāl* (Acts IV and III); (*iv*) Sport (Act II) and sleep (Act V) in the *Svapna*; (*v*) calling aloud from a distance in the *Pañc* (Act II); (*vi*) non-mention of the name of the author or the work in the prologue; etc.[2]

Some words are used in a sense different from that assigned to them by the *Nāṭyaśāstra*; e. g. in the *Svapna* (p. 128) and *Bāl* (p. 65), 'Āryaputra' is used as a term of address from a servant.

---

1 Winternitz, *Problems*, p. 120. 2 Cf. Banerji Sastri, *JBORS*. 1929, pp. 62-65; Macdonell, *HSL*., p. 348; Taike, *MS*, 5, p. 105.

2. There is a 'rapidity in the progress of action for which the frequent stage direction निष्क्रम्य प्रविश्य' is used.[1] As each play abounds in such scenes using the stage direction, citation of instances seems unnecessary.

3. There is a frequent recourse to *Ākāśabhāṣita*, a kind of monologue in which one person only speaks repeating the speeches of other persons not on the stage, and answers them. This device is employed in the *Dv* (pp. 6, 8), *Avi* (pp. 5, 8, 15, 23), *Abh* (p. 60), *Cār* (pp. 8, 9), *Pratijñā* (p. 64), etc.

4. For describing battles, duels, battlefields, sacrifices or some events the poet selects the narrator or narrators from amongst the Brahmins, warriors or fairies.

Triads are employed in the *Abh* (fairies), *Ūru* (warriors), *Pañc* and *Mv* (Brahmins); in the two former, for detailing fights on the battlefield; in the latter for describing the sacrifice and the demon Ghaṭotkaca respectively.[2]

A warrior (Bhaṭa) gives the news of fight and at times describes it in the *Pañc* (Act II pp. 52–71), *Bāl* (Act V pp. 57–59), and *Abh* (Act III pp. 36–38; V, p. 63).

5. The entry of a person of high rank such as a king, a princess or a minister is announced with the identical words उस्सरह उस्सरह। अय्या! उस्सरह।. This is found in the *Svapna* (pp. 6, 8), *Pratijña* (p. 63), *Prat* (p. 63, 66) and *Ūru* (p. 99).

6. The audience is acquainted with the intervening events in the action of the play necessary for the furtherance of the plot by a chamberlain, who generally addresses the female door-keeper with the stereotyped words क इह भोः! काञ्चन(or रत्न)तोरणद्वारमशून्यं कुरुते। and on the entry of the door-keeper asks the latter to communicate the news (of those intervening events) to the king or someone—निवेद्यतां निवेद्यतां.....etc.

In Act VI of the *Svapna* (p. 119), the Kāñcukīya tells Udayana about the arrival of a Brahmin and the nurse of Vāsavadattā from Mahāsena, in the above formula. Similarly in the *Abh*, Act III (p. 33), the news

1 Winternitz, *CR*, Dec. 1924, p. 340. 2 *Abh*, Act VI (pp. 68–74); *Ūru* (pp. 92–96); *Pañc*, Act I (pp. 4–15); *Mv*, (pp. 5–6).

about the destruction of the pleasure-garden and the death of Akṣa is broached with similar preliminaries. Cf. also, the *Prat*, Act VI (p. 111) where the news is about the return of Sumantra.

The second form alone, viz. निवेदयतां निवेदयतां महाराजाय etc. to deliver the news is found in the following places: *Pañc*, Act II (p. 52); *Karṇa* (p. 72); *Dgh* (p. 50).

7. A character knows what passes in another's mind from the face of the latter. Cf. तुवं किं वि वत्तुकामा विअ। (*Prat*, p. 13); प्रतिवचनार्थिनीमिव त्वां पश्यामि। (*Prat*, p. 95); णणु किंचिद्वत्तुकामासि। (*Avi*, p. 1); सुग्रीव! वक्तुकाममिव त्वां लक्षये। (*Abh*, p. 50); वक्तुकाममिव त्वां लक्षये। (*Pratijñā*, p. 25); विभीषण! निर्विण्णमिव त्वां लक्षये। (*Abh*, p. 40).

The similarities that we have noticed above in disregarding the rules of Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* and in the recurrence of certain dramatic devices and situations could not have been mere accidents. They certainly show the working of the same hand.

3. COMMUNITY OF IDEAS

found in all the plays of the group also strengthens the case of common authorship. "A particular author takes fancy to a particular idea and cannot help repeating the same in more than one place";[1] and hence the same idea expressed in identical words leaves no question as to the unity of authorship. Some of the striking instances are given below.

i. Our poet is very fond of the idea that natural arm is the most appropriate weapon for the brave. This is found in the *Bāl*, *Mv*, *Pañc* and *Avi*.[2]

ii. Nārada is described as an expert at lute and fond of instigating quarrels. Cf. *Avi*, VI, 11 तन्त्रीषु च स्वरग्रहान्कलहांश्च लोके। with *Bāl*, I. 4. तन्त्रीश्च वैराणि च घट्टयामि।

iii. Dhṛtarāṣṭra is described as being created blind owing to the jealousy of gods, as the latter were afraid he would trouble the heavens. Cf. *Ūru*, 36 (p. 100) with *Dgh*, 35 (p. 64).[3]

---

1 Sarup, Fission, Intr, p. 15. See pp. 15-16 for instances from Oscar Wilde. 2 *Bāl*, III. 11. बाहू समेतौ, प्रहरणं...(p. 45). *Mv*, 42. बाहुरत्नुधे सदृशं मम (p. 32); *Pañc*, II. 55. सहजौ मे प्रहरणं भुजौ (p. 88). *Avi*, II. 11. बलमपि च भुजावुपमानाः (p. 31). 3 Devdhar, *Plays etc*, p. 7.

iv. Arjuna's deeds of valour e.g., his encounter with Śaṅkara in the form of a Kirāta, fights with the Nivātakavacas are almost similarly expressed in the *Dv*, 32-33, *Dgh*., 22 and *Ūru*, 14.

v. The inference from the trees being watered, that the city must be somewhere in the vicinity is found in the *Prat* and *Abh*. *Prat*, p. 57. सोपस्नेहतया वृक्षाणामनितः खल्वयोध्यया भवितव्यम् । *Abh*, p. 6. सोपस्नेहतया वनान्तरस्थाभितः खलु किष्किन्धया भवितव्यम् ।

vi. The insistence of a particular idea in different situations and in different works indicates one individuality.[1] Cf. *Avi*, III. 2 नगरपरिचितोऽहं etc. with *Cār* I. 13. परिचितितिमिरा etc.

vii. The idea that kings though dead in body live through their sacrifices and good works is found expressed in the *Pañc* I. 23 नष्टाः शरीरैः ऋतुभिर्वरन्ते and *Karṇa* 17. इतेषु देहेषु गुणा वरन्ते ।

viii. That wealth or prosperity revels in adventurous spirit is told in the *Cār*, *Dv*, *Pañc* and *Svapna*. It is also said therein that it does not rest in contentment[2].

A consideration of the above similarities would rather indicate linking together of all the plays, *viz.*, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the historical and original plays (including the *Cār*).

Important for the study of the common authorship is the use of

4. PATĀKĀSTHĀNAKA AND SIMILAR DRAMATIC DEVICES

which is found in most of the plays. Following are some of the many instances :

i. In the *Pratijñā*, Act II (pp. 29-30), King *Mahāsena*, in conference with his queen to select a suitable match for the princess, asks the queen, after enumerating a list of worthy suiters; "which of these do you find worthy of our daughter?" Presently a chamberlain

---

1 A similar idea is found in *Cār* (p. 79-गृहविशिष्ट एवायं भवविन्यासः ।) 2 Sarup, *Vision*, intr. p. 18. 3 *Cār*, p. 98 साहसे खलु श्रीर्वसति ।; *Dv*, 24-राज्यं नाम नृपासमैः सहदयैर्जित्वा रिपून् भुज्यते । *Pañc* II. 6. श्रीर्न सन्तोषमिच्छति । *Svapna* V. 6-7. आवेग हि नरेन्द्राणां सोत्साहैरेव भुज्यते ।

enters with the words 'Vatsarāja.' He had come to announce the news of the capture of Vatsarāja. Here the word 'Vatsarāja' serves as an answer to the king's question, though the chamberlain does not mean it.

ii. In the *Abh* (V. 10), Rāvaṇa asks Sītā, when both Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa have been killed at the hands of Indrajit, "by whom will you be set free?" A rākṣasa enters and says "by Rāma." He comes to convey the news of the death of Indrajit "by Rāma."

iii. In the *Avi*, Act II. p. 41, Vilāsinī asks Nalinikā, while talking about the marriage of the princess, "when is the marriage to take place?" At which somebody behind the curtain is heard to say "today." The speaker wants to tell of the absence of the minister "today."

iv. In the *Pañc* (Act I. p. 41) Droṇa gets the answer naming the place whence he can get the news of the Pāṇḍavas.

v. In the *Prat* (Act I. pp. 33-34) while Rāma is asking for bark-garments of Sītā, a maid-servant enters accidentally with new bark-garments from Ārya Revā.

These are instances of 'verbal irony.' Often times the irony of remark and situation are united.

In the *Mv* (pp. 21-36) Bhīma presents himself before Ghatotkaca in answer to his call for 'Madhyama.' The latter does not know that he is talking with his father and hence his remarks are essentially provocative of mirth. The *Pañc* presents a similar situation of comic irony (pp. 80-90).

An instance of tragic irony is furnished by the *Dgh* (pp. 52-53) where, on hearing of the ruthless slaughter of Abhimanyu, Duḥśalā remarks that "the killer of Abhimanyu has brought widowhood on the maidens on the Kauravas' side," not knowing who the actual killer was. Later on it transpires that her own husband, Jayadratha, was the culprit. At this news Dhṛtarāṣṭra exclaims हन्त! जयद्रथो निहतः which brings the significance of her previous utterance to the unhappy Duḥśalā, and she weeps.

The *Svapna* and *Pratijña* abound in numerous instances of these *patākāsthānakas*. Frequency of these

instances of dramatic irony in our group lends one more chain to the link of common authorship.

We also find

5. SIMILAR DRAMATIC SITUATIONS

in these plays.

i. The following from the *Prat* and *Abh* speak for themselves :

सीता (सरोषं)—सन्तो सि ।	सीता—सन्तो सि ।
रावणः—हहह । अहो पतिव्रतायास्तेजः ।	रावणः—हहह । अहो पतिव्रतायास्तेजः ।
योऽहमुत्पतितो वेगाच्च दग्धः सूर्यरश्मिभिः ।	देवाः सेन्द्रादयो भग्ना दानवाश्च मया रणे ।
अस्याः परिभितैर्दग्धः शप्तोऽस्मीत्येभिरक्षरैः ॥	सोऽहं मोहं गतोऽस्मद्य सीतायाक्षिभिरक्षरैः ॥
Prat, V. 20 (p. 107).	*Abh*, II. 18 (p. 27)

These identical situations present Sītā as rejecting Rāvaṇa's overtures with a curse, which thoroughly unnerves the latter. Śakāra is replied in the same way by Vasantasenā (*Cār*, p. 22). A confusion between सन्तो सि and शन्तो सि is found in the *Cār*, doubtless suggested by similar wording in the *Prat*, where सन्ती सि is a variant for सन्तो सि (p. 86, 1st edition)[1]. This would indicate the linking together of the *Prat* and *Cār*, and of the former and *Abh*.

ii. The spirited question that the young heroes put when asked to pay respects to the king (Mahārāja) is identically worded आः कस्य महाराजः in the *Bāl* (p. 61) and *Pañc* (p. 87).

iii. The *Pañc* and *Prat* present similar situations in following one order (*krama*), and getting it corrected after अयमक्रमः and अथ कः क्रमः । See *Prat* (p. 48); *Pañc* (p. 19).

iv. When a report, apparently incredible, is brought to the master, he naturally doubts its authenticity and the veracity of the messenger, to which the latter humbly retorts by saying that he has never given out a lie to his master.

Thus, we have in the *Pratijña* (p. 32): when the Kāñcukīya brought the news of the capture of Vatsarāja which Mahāsena refused to believe the Kāñcu-

1 In the verse also *Prat* (V. 20) 'शान्तोऽसि' is a variant for 'शप्तोऽसि'. A mere copyist or a simple imitator would not be able to appreciate the significance, importance and connotation of the readings and variants. The author himself must have used them in all the three.

kīya apologetically remarks: प्रसीदतु महासेनः । वृद्धोऽस्मि ब्राह्मणः खलूहम् । न महासेनसमीपेऽनृतमभिहितपूर्वम् ।

So, in the *Bāl* (p. 27) when Kaṁsa doubts the news of the birth of a son to Devakī brought by the Kāñcukīya, the latter says महाराज ! अनृतं नाभिहितपूर्वं मया । The same remarks are found in the *Abh* (p. 63) and *Pañc* (p. 65).

v. Daśaratha, Vālin, Duryodhana, in their vision that they have at the time of their death, have the same experience, and the incidents are similarly worded. Cf. *Prat* (p. 51) ; *Abh* (p. 16) ; *Ūru* (p. 114).

The consideration of similar dramatic situations naturally brings us to the study of

6. DRAMATIC SCENES.

In the *Pratijñā* (Act II) a scene is described in which the powerful Mahāsena is depicted as worrying over the question of the selection of a suitable match for his daughter, and consulting the queen in the matter. It is quite a domestic scene which is disturbed by the entry of a chamberlain with some news. Act I of the *Avi* presents a similar scene. The powerful king like another Mahāsena boasts of having vanquished powerful enemies but still he feels no pleasure as he is worried in the matter of choosing a suitable husband for his daughter. He sends for the queen and speaks over the matter to her. It is also a domestic scene which comes to an end by the entry of a chamberlain.

These two scenes are in their essence quite identical. The scene in the *Pratijñā* is an amplified version of that in the *Avi*; so the *Avi*, was written first. Prof. Jahagirdar assigns the two plays to different ages;[1] but the difference in treatment is explicable on the ground of the plays being the products of different periods in the poet's career. None can expect a mechanical uniformity in all the works of an author. Both plays display the same workmanship.[2]

The opening scene in the third Act of the *Bāl* is similar to that of the second Act of the *Pañc*. Both paint the pastoral life. In the *Pañc*, the cattle are to be gathered for a ceremony and an old herdsman calls out to others

1 *JA*, 1931, p. 44. 2 Sarup, Vision, Intr, p. 30.

to be ready for song and dance. In the *Bāl* also, an old cowherd calls out to the maidens and young herdsmen to participate in song and dance. In both the plays, blessings on the cows and villagers are invoked, and the close of the dance is marked by ही ही घुट्टु घुचिदं घुट्टु गाहदं। जाव अहं पि णच्चेमि from the old man. According to Prof. Devdhar, "there can be no reasonable doubt that these lively and truly bucolic scenes come from the same hand".[1]

The *Cār* (Acts I and III) and *Avi* (Act III) describing the city at night present many similarities.

A close study of the plays will reveal that there are numerous similes and images that are peculiarly used in these plays. Prof. Devdhar has given an exhaustive list of such parallelisms under

7. COMMON IMAGERY.[2]

It is not necessary, therefore, to cover the same ground. There are some conventional and accepted similes of Sanskrit rhetoricians, but many of the images used in these plays are specialities of our poet and hence prove common authorship. Note especially the comparison of a powerful adversary with a lion or tiger and of his weaker rival with an elephant, deer or fawn.[3] Equally notable is the comparison of a person to the moon in the midst of stars.[4]

"That the plays have one author is also made probable by the fact that certain words and phrases occur in all or several of them". We may, therefore, consider these under

8. AGREEMENT OF VOCABULARY AND EXPRESSION.

Prof. Devdhar takes exception to the inclusion of such words as को कालो, का गतिः, बाढम्, प्रथमः कल्पः, एकातपत्रा etc. etc. under this heading,[5] which have been cited by Dr. Winternitz as indicating common authorship.

---

1 *Plays etc.*, p. 13. 2 *Plays etc.*, pp. 3-6. 3 *Abh.* III. 20 कर्ण कन्यासदः सिंहो मृगेण विनिपात्यते। *Prat.* V. 18. न व्याघ्रं मृगशिशवः पर्यवयन्ति। *Mr.* 3. व्याघ्रानुसारचकितो हरिणः शोणुः। *Cār* I. 9 व्याघ्रानुसारचकिता हरिणी...। *Mr.* 44. सोऽपि कुञ्जरो वन्यो न व्याघ्रं पर्येवहते। *Dr.* 10. हरिभिव मृगीतौ तेजसाभिपपातौ। Also *Abh.* II. 13; *Bāl.* IV. 18, etc. 4 *Dr.* 3. नक्षत्रमध्य इव पर्वगतः शशाङ्कः। *Prat.* VII. 14. चन्द्रं सनक्षत्रमिवोदयस्थम्। *Abh.* p. 26. दुर्दिनान्तर्गता चन्द्रलेखेव। *Mr.* 33....विधुचन्द्रस्य...राहुरिव। 5 Winternitz, *Problems*, p. 118. 6 *Plays etc.* p. 8.

i. Be that as it may, there should be no difference of opinion as to the importance of the following words for signifying common authorship. '*Yavanikā*' in the sense of 'a curtain, carpet or veil' occurs in the *Svapna* (p. 140), *Prat* (p. 52), *Ūru* (p. 114) and *Avi* (p. 88). '*Vismita*' is used in the sense of 'proud or vain' in the *Svapna* (p. 9), *Dv* (p. 12) and *Pañc* (p. 28). The root '*vyapaśri*' in the sense of 'pray, beg, request,' finds its place in the *Svapna* (p. 21), *Mv* (p. 11) and *Pañc* (p. 24). '*Samāsa*' in its peculiar meaning occurs in the *Avi* (p. 31), *Pratijñā* (p. 32) and *Pañc* (p. 54). The *Svapna* and *Avi* employ the words दूतसम्पात (*Svapna*, p. 17; *Avi*, p. 12); सुमणावण्णअ (*Svapna*, p. 61; *Avi*, p. 54); दारुवेतक (*Svapna*, p. 70; *Avi*, p. 47); etc.

ii. The following are some of the expressions that are often used in the plays :—

1. अहो द्वास्थमभिधानम्। *Pratijñā*, pp. 67, 71; *Pañc* p. 108; *Dgh*, p. 66.
2. अलमिदानीं भवानतिमात्रं सन्तप्य। *Svapna*, p. 123; *Avi*, p. 83; *Cār*, p. 12 (अलं दाणिं भवं अदिमत्तं सन्तप्पि अ).
3. सहचारिणोऽनर्थाः। *Pratijñā*, p. 52; *Avi*, p. 14 (सहआरिणो अणत्थ)
4. (तस्य) आवासं एव गच्छामि। *Avi*, p. 14; *Cār*, p. 10.
5. श्रूयतां मम पराक्रमः। *Abh*, p. 8; *Prat*, p. 105; *Bāl*, p. 15 (सुणादु भट्टा मम बल (पल ?) क्कमम्)

Cf. also, *Svapna*, p. 134 and *Pañc*, p. 103; *Svapna*, p. 52 and *Abh*, p. 30.

Another striking evidence about the common authorship of these plays is the

9. RECURRENCE OF STANZAS, HEMISTICHES AND VERSES, AS ALSO OF SHORT AND LONG PROSE PASSAGES.

Dr. Sukthankar in his 'Studies in Bhāsa, IV'[1] has given an exhaustive list of the above-mentioned "Recurrences and parallelisms" and their total number is 127. The number itself should lead us a long way along our passage into the unsettled and slippery path beset with many thorns and help us towards the solution of common authorship.

1 *ABI*, 4, 1938, Extra Issue, pp. 167-187.

A few of the notable repetitions are given below :—

i. किं वक्ष्यतीति हृदयं परिशङ्कितं मे । *Svapna*, VI. 15 ; *Abh*, IV. 7.

ii. धर्मज्ञेहान्तरे न्यस्ता । *Pratijña*, II. 7 ; *Abh*, VI. 23.

iii. लिम्पतीव तमोऽङ्गानि etc. *Bāl*, I. 15 ; *Cār*, I. 19.

iv. सम्भ्रमोत्कुललोचना *Dv*, 7 ; *Cār*, IV. 3.

v. यदि तेऽस्ति धनुःश्लाघा । *Prat*, I. 20 ; *Abh*, III. 22.

Regarding the short and long prose passages that recur in these plays, it would be an unnecessary repetition to detail them here. They will be found in sufficient number in this chapter alone, and a mere reference to them will be, it is hoped, sufficient.

i. See above Sec. 2 Sub-section (6)
ii. „ „ „ 3 „ (v).
iii. „ „ „ 5 „ (v).
iv. „ „ „ 8 „ (2).

some of the plays we find

10. A PREDILECTION FOR CERTAIN DESCRIPTIONS.

such as is generally found in works of one and the same poet.[1]

Descriptions of darkness are found in the first Act of the *Bāl*, the third Act of the *Avi* and the first Act of the *Cār*. A city at night is described in the *Cār* and *Avi*.

The poet is a master-hand at describing battles, combats and battle-fields, and the various particulars are so minutely and realistically portrayed that the scenes present themselves before our eyes. We have such descriptions in the *Abh* (pp. 68-74) and *Ūru* (pp. 89-95).

11. A CONSIDERATION OF METRES

also points to common authorship. Excepting some early works of the poet, we find preponderance of the epic śloka in these plays. Metrical irregularities are in a line with the epic usage and tradition. As the 'Metrics' will be dealt with in detail later on, some facts only are stated below.

---

1 Cf. Winternitz, *CR*, 1924, p. 338.

Suvadanā and *Daṇḍaka* which are not used by classical dramatists are found in the *Pañc*, I. 6; *Dv*, 15; *Prat*, III. 7, III. 11; and *Avi*, V. 6.

A peculiarity of the metrical portions of these plays is the occurrence of split up verses[1]. A verse is divided into quarters or hemistiches and each part is used as a speech for a character in the play. Sometimes a prose passage intervenes the metrical speeches. Three characters also share some verses between themselves. Though split-up verses are not a general feature of this group, still their presence in some of these plays shows them to have come from the hands of a single author.

Instances of split-up verses used by the same speaker are: *Avi*, II. 6, II. 14; *Pratijña*, I. 2.

Portions of verses used as speeches for two characters are found in the *Prat*, I. 31, III. 1, 14, IV. 24, VII. 14 *Cru*, 66; *Avi*, VI. 21; *Bāl*, V. 10 and *Pañc*, II. 34, 37.

Three speakers use a verse between themselves at the following places; *Cru*, 21; *Abh*, VI. 1, 5.

As justly stated by Dr. Winternitz, "it is also worth mentioning that in such small details as the names of persons of secondary importance several of the plays agree with one another."[2]

12. SAME NAMES OF DRAMATIS PERSONAE

in different plays, therefore, constitute a strong argument in favour of their common origin. The chamberlain of Duryodhana in the *Dv* and of Mahāsena in the *Pratijñā* is named Bādarāyaṇa. A female door-keeper is introduced by the identical name Vijayā in the *Svapna*, *Pratijñā*, *Abh*, and *Prat*. Vṛṣabhadatta and Kumbhadatta are the names of herdsmen in the *Pañc* and *Bāl*.

The most striking evidence of the common authorship of these plays is their

13. GRAMMATICAL SOLECISMS AND PRAKRIT ARCHAISMS.

These are not peculiar to some of the plays only as

1. Some of the important verses are given in extenso in appendix II. Here all the verses are merely referred to. 2 *Problems*, p. 119.

is maintained by Prof. Jahagirdar,[1] but are common to all the plays. Many of the grammatical forms are justified by Dr. Sukthankar on the ground of epic usage;[2] but for our present purpose it would suffice to show that they are found in all the plays of the group. Dr. Ganapati Sastri's list would show that no solecisms occur in the *Karṇa* and *Ūru*.[3]

That these dramas present the same Prakrit archaisms will be clear from our study of the "Prakrit" of these plays. Some instances are the following:—"तुवं" *Cār*, pp. 45,96; *Svapna*, pp. 68, 92; *Prat*, p. 12; *Ūru*, pp. 104, 105; *Pratijñā*, pp. 40, 43; *Bāl*, p. 34; *Avi*, pp. 15, 77. "तु" *Dgh*, p. 51; *Mv*, p. 37; *Ūru*, pp. 105, 108; *Pratijñā*, pp. 4,20; *Abh*, pp. 20, 27; *Bāl*, p. 9; *Avi*, pp. 14,49; *Prat*, pp. 116, 126; *Svapna*, pp. 66, 106; *Cār*, pp. 3, 61. "गच्छिअ" *Partijñā*, pp. 8, 10; *Pañc*, p. 48; *Cār*, p. 2. "करिअ" *Pratijñā*, pp. 11, 15; *Cār*, p. 60; *Svapna*, p. 107. अहाअं *Pañc*, p. 49; *Mv*, p. 7. 'आम' *Cār*, p. 5; *Abh*, p. 19; *Prat*, p. 117; *Svapna*, pp. 54, 136; *Bāl*, p. 11; *Avi*, pp. 29,85; *Pratijñā*, pp. 35, 47. Though these be taken not to help us in fixing the date of the plays, they may yet be taken as products of the same age, presumably of the same author.

Uniformity with regard to solecisms and archaisms "is the most unquestionable proof that places beyond all doubt the common origin of these plays".[4] If it were not so, it is quite inexplicable why the imitator, the adaptor or compiler—one or more—should follow the original in its mistakes also. Hence, it is almost certain that all these plays with all their merits and defects show the working of the same hand.

14. REMARKABLE SIMILARITY IN SOCIAL CONDITIONS

in these plays is also another strong ground for common origin. Some notable features are mentioned below.

i. All the plays reveal the author to be a strict follower of orthodox Brahmanical system, and a zealous worshipper of Viṣṇu. The militant Brahmanism of the author is not so conspicuous in the *Avi*, *Svapna*, *Pratijñā* and *Cār*, as it is in the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa* plays,

1 *IA*, 1931, p. 44. 2 *JAOS*, 41, pp. 107-130. 3 *Critical Study*, appendix 1. Dr. G. Sastri's list would show a solecism in the *Cār* also; See *JAOS*, 41, p. 129. 4 Paranjape, *Pratimā*, Intr, p. VII.

but there is nothing in the former that should contradict the assumption that the author was a Brāhmaṇa and a Vaiṣṇava.[1]

ii. Brāhmaṇas were held in high esteem, the truth of their statements was never questioned.[2]

iii. Noteworthy also is the use of metronyms in the *Bāl*, *Svapna*, *Prat*, *Pañc* and *Dv*—यादवीमातः, शौरसेनीमातः, वैदेही-पुत्रः, कौसल्यामातः, etc.

iv. Music is approvingly referred to in the *Pratijñā* (Act I), *Svapna* (Act V, VI), *Cār* (Act III), and *Avi* (Act III).

Another very peculiar feature that we come across in a number of these plays is the

15. ACTUAL BRINGING OF WATER ON THE STAGE

after a demand for it which is found probably nowhere in Sanskrit dramas. Water is required for purifying purposes, by a dying or sorrowing person, for honouring a superior, for giving sanctity to a pledge, and so on. The demand is usually made in the form आपस्तावत्, while the bearer comes with इमा आपः। This occurs no less than eleven times and in seven dramas of the group.

i. Thus we find the demands made by Daśaratha and Vālin at the time of their death.[3] *ii.* In the *Pratijñā*, Yaugandharāyaṇa asks for water for declaring his vow.[4] *iii.* Ghaṭotkaca and Bhīma in the *Mv* demand water for chanting *mantras*.[5] *iv.* In the *Dv* and *Prat*, water is required for paying homage to the Lord and as a *pādya* for the guests respectively.[6] *v.* Demand is also made for washing the face of a person who has been weeping.[7] It was reputed to remove the impurity attached to tears.[8]

"Water" introduced so frequently has led Prof.

---

1 Cf. Devdhar, *Plays etc*, p. 17; Winternitz, *Problems*, pp. 116–117. 2 Cf. *Mv*, p. 30. पूज्यतमः खलु ब्राह्मणः। *Karṇa*, p. 84. ब्राह्मणवचनमिति। न मयातिक्रान्तपूर्वम्। *Bāl*, p. 27. ब्राह्मणवचनमनृतमपि सत्यं पश्यामि। *Pañc*, I. 22. विप्रोत्सृष्टे विसमावर्ज्ये सर्वे राजा देवं चापमावे सुतेभ्यः। The prayer in *Pañc* and *Bāl* for happiness for Brahmins. 3 *Prat*, p. 51; *Abh*, p. 60. 4 *Pratijñā*, p. 21. 5 *Mv*, pp. 34, 35. 6 *Dv*, p. 24; *Prat*, p. 98. 7 *Pañc*, p. 26; *Prat*, p. 86; *Svapna*, pp. 80, 87. 8 *Cf. Pañc*, p. 26 अश्रुपातोच्छिष्टस्य मुखस्य क्रियतां शौचम्। also

निष्ठीवने तथाम्भो तथा पादावसेचने।
उच्छिष्टस्य च सम्भाषादशुच्युपहतस्य च॥

Devdhar to style the poet अग्निमित्र side by side with ज्वलनमित्र.'

Probably there is unanimity of opinion that

16. THE SVAPNA AND PRATIJÑĀ

are by the same author.[2] The former is a sequel to the latter. Names and characters of the *dramatis personæ* are the same. The *Svapna* has numerous allusions to the *Pratijñā*. (Cf. VI. 18 last scene). Further comments are deemed unnecessary.

17. THE PRATIMĀ AND ABHIṢEKA

show so many literal agreements that unity of authorship in their case can scarcely be doubted. Rāma is addressed as "Ārya" in both, and Sītā addresses him as 'Āryaputra'. 'Ārya' is the normal form of address to be used in Ikṣvāku family.[3]

There is a remarkable similarity in these plays regarding

18. STYLE, DIALOGUE AND MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS.

The language of these dramas according to Dr. Ganapati Sastri is "clear, lofty and majestic as well as sweet and charming. The sentences are everywhere replete with a wealth of ideas beautifully expressed".[4]

Prof. Devdhar has mentioned "copious use of alliteration and *yamaka* as well as the use of long compounds" as an indication in the line of common authorship.[5] But on closer study the proportion of such poetic conceits will be found to be too small to the usual simple elegant style, to warrant the inference of common authorship therefrom.

From considerations of style, Mr. A. K. Pisharoti would link the *Svapna*, *Prat*, *Abh* and *Pratijñā* as earlier dramas, and the *Avi*, *Pañc* and *Ūru* are linked as modern ones.[6] It is interesting to note in this connection, that

---

1 *Plays etc.*, p. 12. 2 Sarup, Vision, Intr. pp. 11-12; Devdhar, *Plays etc*, p. 80; Winternitz, *CH*, 1924, p. 337; *BRRI*, 1937, p. 1; Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 142. Even the antagonists admit common authorship of these two plays. Cf. Johnston, *IA*, 1933, pp. 95-99; Jahagirdar, *IA*, 1931, pp. 41-45; Devdhar, *Plays etc*, pp. 19-20. 3 Dr. Winternitz seems to assign 'आर्येति इक्ष्वाकुकुलालापः सत्त्वम्' (*Prat*, p. 64) to Bharata (*Problems*, p. 118). It would seem that the mistake crept in through oversight as the above is the speech of Devakulika. Dr. Winternitz's optulons, as already stated, are now changed. 4 *Critical Study*, p. 27. 5 *Plays etc.* p. 19. See Contra, Jayaswal, *JASB*. 1913, p. 261. 6 *Criticism*, p. 23.

Prof. Jahagirdar on the same grounds unites the *Svapna* and *Pratijñā* with the *Pañc* and assigns the *Avi*, *Prat* and *Ūru* to a later date.[1]

There are short dialogues seen everywhere in the plays.

All the plays are "one and all the works of a born dramatist wonderfully adapted to the stage".[2]

The epithets सूत्रधारकृतारम्भ, बहुभूमिक and सपताक can be applied to all these plays and they also show the ज्वलनमित्रत्व of the poet, as will be shown in the next chapter. Daṇḍin's remarks सुविभक्तमुखादयः etc. admirably suit all these works.

A familiar feature of many of these plays is the interest in, one might almost say the

19. SYMPATHY WITH KINGS AND WARRIORS ON THE BRINK OF RUIN,

whether this be due to a curse or to their own wickedness.[3] Karṇa in the *Karṇa*, Duryodhana in the *Ūru* and *Pañc*, and Vālin in the *Abh* are instances in point.

Finally, the most convincing proof of common authorship, as noted by Kirāta,[4] is furnished by the prevalence of one underlying note in all these plays, viz., of

20. SVARĀJYA.

The prayer in the epilogue of some of the plays is परचक्रं प्रशाम्यतु ।. Udayana plays are permeated with the idea of regaining the Vatsa kingdom. The Mahābhārata plays also breathe the note of recovering the kingdom for the Pāṇḍavas. In the *Bāl*, Kṛṣṇa places Ugrasena on the kingdom of Mathurā after slaying Kaṁsa. In the Rāma plays, Rāma is crowned king towards the end, king of Svarājya. The *Avi* also gives to its hero the kingdom, and the *Cār*, to judge from its sequel as found in the *Mṛcch*, also tells of the good government being guaranteed to the people by the dethroning of the tyrant Pālaka and the crowning of Āryaka. As this idea is found pervading all the plays, it proclaims their common authorship.

---

1 *IA*, 1931, pp. 41–45. 2 Winternitz, *Problems*, p. 129. 3 Woolner and Sarup, *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Vol. II, p. 145. 4 Marathi translation, pp. 25–26.

Thus, a careful study of the problem, under various heads, leads us to the definite conclusion that all the plays are the products of one and the same brain. All the plays are found to be linked and interwoven, *inter se*, by strong chains. The *Cār* which has been excluded by Prof. Devdhar who vouchsafes for the common authorship of the twelve plays,[1] has also been proved by us to show many common characteristics.

Dr. Raja would deny one author for this group as, according to him, the maximum number of works by a single author is only three, generally one.[2] This does not seem to be cogent and sound. Against this, the tradition noted above may prove a different thing;[3] further, it may be stated that six dramas of one Vatsarāja have been published in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series.

The *Pratimā* is not given a place in the Bhāsa dramas as, it is alleged, it refers to the Bhāṣya of Medhātithi.[4] But the boast of Rāvaṇa of having studied the *Manubhāṣya* "would be such a ridiculous anachronism that we must refuse to credit even an alleged plagiarist of tenth or eleventh century with such an abysmal absurdity".[5] Further, the *Prat* is already shown to be closely related with other plays of the group.

SOME CONTRARY VIEWS REFUTED.

In Dr. Keith's opinion, "the arguments of Mr. Jahagirdar seem quite insufficient to establish two groups".[6] The differences in style, proportion of metres etc, are due to the exigencies of the subject, different sentiments requiring different styles, and due to the works being written in different periods of the poet's life. Some are his earlier productions, while some are the products of his mature genius. This answers Dr. Barnett, Messrs. Pisharotis, Prof. Woolner, Mr. Sankar, Dr. Johnston and others.[7] Even the works of Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti, Shakespeare etc. do not show uniformity.

As to Prof. Dhruva's arguments,[8] all the *Mahā-*

---

1 *Plays etc.*, pp. 19-20. 2 *ZII*, 2, p. 257. 3 See above, also GOS. No. 8, *Rūpakaṣaṭkam* by Vatsarāja. 4 Barnett, *BSOS*, 3, p. 35; Kane, *VJV*, 1920, p. 100. 5 Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 132. The point is considered in detail later on. 6 Letter dated 16-3-32. 7 Barnett, *BSOS*, 3, p. 521; Pisharotis, *BSOS*, 5, pp. 107-108; Woolner, *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Vol. 1, Intr; Sankar, *AMV*, 2, p. 64; Johnston, *Id.*, 1933, pp. 95-99. 8 *Pratimā*, Ahm. Intr, p. 22. *Thakkar Vasanji Lectures*, p. 206 N. 18.

bhārata plays are very closely related as would appear from our study above. So the four plays stated by him (viz., the *Dv*, *Dgh*, *Karṇa* and *Ūru*) cannot be separated from the *Mv*, and *Pañc*. The *Prat* and *Abh* must definitely be from the pen of the same author as the striking similarities pronounce. The verse त्रेतायुगं • • • तद्धि न मैथिली सा referred to by Abhinavagupta as coming from Bhāsa fits in suitably in the *Abh* and not in the *Prat* as suggested by Prof. Dhruva.[1] The discrepancies in the two works observed by Prof. Dhruva are due to the *Abh* being an earlier work, and also due to the poet's non-observance of the unities of time and place. The points of affinity between the *Prat* and *Abh* are so remarkable and convincing that they oust the idea of different authorship or imitation.

The similarities in thought noted by us above, cannot be passed over too lightly. The style may be easily imitated, but not the spirit, and many other peculiarities that appertain to an individual. Hence, it is our considered opinion that there are very strong grounds for holding a common authorship.

In conclusion, the result of our investigation may thus be expressed in the words of Dr. Sarup: "The community of technique, language, style, ideas, treatment and identity of names of *dramatis personæ*, prose and metrical passages and scenes are so remarkable that the conclusion of their common authorship is inevitable."[2]

---

1 Dhruva, *Pratimā*, Intr, pp. 28-29. *Do. Abh., Gr.*, p. 364. We have shown in the next chapter in detail the place of the verse in the *Abh*. Abhinavagupta cites the verse as coming from Bhāsa, and Prof. Dhruva assigns the authorship of seven plays of the group to Bhāsa. So the *Abh* cannot be ruled out. 2 *HR*, 1927, p. 119.

CHAPTER II.

AUTHORSHIP OF BHĀSA
and
AUTHENTICITY OF THE TRIVANDRUM PLAYS.

After having established at least a *prima facie* case for holding all the plays to be the productions of one and the same author, the next point to be considered is the 'author' of these plays. The fate of Bhāsa seems to be a peculiarly unhappy one. So long, the loss of his works was deplored; but now that the works have appeared before the public, they are "assured to be compilations and adaptations".[1] Is it that the unlucky, inauspicious number thirteen, which happens to be that of the works so far available, has played the trick?

I. SVAPNA AND SVAPNAVĀSAVADATTA -(•ttā)

When MM. Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri published the first edition of the *Svapna*, the MSS read स्वप्ननाटकम् (or वास-वदत्ता नाटिका) and the learned editor took them to be the contracted forms of the full name *Svapnavāsavadatta*. Many were the scholars who held that both were quite distinct works.[2] Bhattanātha Swami even objected to the title of the *Svapna* being given to the Trivandrum work and contended that the subject-matter of the real *Svapna* was quite distinct from that of the latter. The real *Svapna*, according to him, deals with the love and marriage of Udayana with Vāsavadattā. But in his subsequent tours in search of MSS, Dr. G. Sastri came across four MSS from different sources of which some gave the name *Svapnavāsavadattā* in the colophon.[3] "A hitherto unutilised palm-leaf MS written in old Malayalam characters" used by Dr. Sarup also read *Svapnavāsava-*

1 Keith, *BSOS*, 3, p. 295. 2 Raddi, *VJV*, 47, pp. 210-211, 215; Barnett, *BSOS*, 3, pp. 35, 521-522; A. K. Pisharoti, *Criticism*, pp. 14, 17; K. Rama Pisharoti, *IHQ*, 1, p. 110; *BSOS*, 3, pp. 639-642; Bhattanātha, *IA*, 45, p. 190; Macdonell, *India's Past*, p. 103; Raja, *JOR*, 1, pp. 233, 237-242, 245 (printed *Svapna* abridgment of the first few acts of a bigger drama of that name by Bhāsa). 3 *Critical Study*, p. 18.

datta as the title of the work and thus Dr. Sastri's conjecture was supported from a different source.[1] Under these circumstances, it is rather remarkable that as late as in 1925, Prof .K. R. Pisharoti should say—"Local MSS never read *Svapnavāsavadatta*".[2]

A further confirmation for holding the works designated by different titles as *Svapna Nāṭaka*, *Svapnavāsavadatta* or *Svapnavāsavadattā* are identica is furnished by *Śākuntalavyākhyā*, an unpublished MS in the Govt. Oriental MSS Library, Madras; herein many quotations from a *Svapnavāsavadattā* are found, which are seen without any change in the Trivandrum play.[3] Hence the name *Svapnavāsavadatta* given to that play is indisputable, and the Bhāsa theory cannot be assailed simply on account of difference in the title.

In dramatic literature at least two works bearing identical titles are not found. Dramatists treating the same subject, e.g. Rāma dramas, Udayana dramas, etc. select distinct titles, and the *Cār* and the *Mṛcch* prove the same thing. One of the *Kalyāṇasaugandhikas* mentioned by Dr. Barnett is not a dramatic work[4] and there is nothing to support the existence of another *Bālacarita*.[5] We have shown elsewhere in this work that the quotation in the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* may well be from the *Bāl* as published in the T. S. S. Thus, there being no evidence in support of two dramas bearing the same name, it may safely be assumed that there is only one *Svapna* in Sanskrit drama.

Authorship of one of the plays will establish the authorship of the group. We find in the works on rhetorics many references to a *Svapnavāsavadatta* and a couple of references mention the work as well as its author.

We shall first consider direct references to a *Svapnavāsavadatta* in their chronological order and see whether the *Svapnavāsavadattas* referred to therein are one or many, and whether they are identical with our work. The direct references are:—

---

1 Vishm, preface, p. II. At the colophon, however, evidently through oversight, the name *Svapna* has been printed instead of *Svapnavāsavadatta* (Vishm, p. 62). 2 *BSOS*, 3, p. 640. 3 *Abhiṣeka*, Lahore, Intr, p. VIII; Venkatarama Sastri, *IHQ*, 5, p. 724. 4 Barnett, *BSOS*, 3, pp. 338; 521; *JRAS*, 1925, p. 656; Thomas, *JRAS*, 1925, p. 107. 5 G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, p. 21; Khuperkar, *Lokaśikṣaṇa*, 5, p. 326; H. Sastri, *MASI*, 28, p. 10.

i. Ācārya Abhinavaguptapāda (10th Century).
ii. Bhojadeva in the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* (11th Century).
iii. Śāradātanaya in the *Bhāvaprakāśa* (12th Century).
iv. Sarvānanda in the *Amarakośaṭīkāsarvasva* (12th Century).
v. Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra in the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* (End of the 12th Century).
vi. Sāgaranandin in the *Nāṭakalakṣaṇa Ratnakośa* (13th or 14th Century).
vii. *Śākuntalavyākhyā* (14th Century).

ABHINAVAGUPTA.

i. While commenting on Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, 1. 74, Abhinavagupta refers to the *krīḍā* in a *Svapnavāsavadattā*—**क्वचित् क्रीडा। यथा स्वप्नवासवदत्तायाम्।** This refers to the *kanduka-krīḍā* mentioned in Act II, though Dr. Raja would take it to refer to the incidents in Acts V and VI of the printed *Svapna*.[1] MM. Kuppuswami Sastri holds the *Svapna* mentioned by Abhinavagupta as different from our text, as hilarious merriment (*krīḍā*) is not the chief feature (*pradhāna*) in the plot of our play; while Bhattanatha Swami, accepting that our play has *krīḍā* in it, doubts its authenticity on other grounds.[2] After Praveśaka, the second act opens with the stage direction **ततः प्रविशति कन्दुकेन क्रीडन्ती पद्मावती सपरिवारा वासवदत्तया सह।** (*Svapna*, p. 40) and this should leave no doubt as to our play containing *krīḍā* and Abhinavagupta referring to our text by '*Svapnavāsavadattā*.'

ii. A hot controversy has raged over the non-inclusion in our present text of the verse mentioned by Abhinavagupta as occurring in a *Svapna*. The context is: **दृश्यन्ते च कवयोऽलंकारनिबन्धनैकरसा अनपेक्षितरसाः प्रबन्धेषु।** from the *Dhvanyāloka*. Abhinavagupta illustrates the remark by: **यथा स्वप्नवासवदत्ताख्ये नाटके,**

सञ्चितपक्ष्मकवाटं नयनद्वारं स्वरूपतदनेन।
उद्घाट्य सा प्रविष्टा हृदयगृहं मे नृपतनूजा॥[3]

It appears from this that the verse from the *Svapna* is an instance where poets care only for figures (*alaṁkāras*) paying no regard to sentiments (*rasas*). This verse is not found in the present text and this has led many a

1 *JOR*, I, p. 234. 2 Kuppuswami Sastri, *Ascarya*, Intr., p. 26; *JOR*, I, p. 234, n. 3; Bhattanatha, *Id.*, 45, p. 198. 3 *Dhvanyālokalocana*, Uddyota 3, p. 152.

critic to regard our text with suspicion.[1] There is a difference of opinion amongst the Bhāsaites as to the probability of the verse finding a place in our text. MM. Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri and others opine that the verse cannot find a place in our *Svapna* as it suits neither Padmāvatī nor Vāsavadattā, since the verse, according to them refers to love at first sight.[2] Prof. Kuppuswami Sastri endorses the same view stating: "This verse does not admittedly find any place anywhere in the *Svapna* of the T. S. S." ; but remarks that Abhinavagupta's great authority cannot be impugned without very strong grounds.[3]

Now, as we have found Abhinavagupta's testimony to be correct in one instance, the same presumption applies to it in the other instance. So we must assume that the verse सञ्चित० etc. occurred in the text at the time of Abhinavagupta. The verse may find a place in the dream-scene. The verse, in plain words, means that the speaker's eyes had been closed and a lady's appearance opened them so that she entered his heart. The king in his half-drowsy state actually sees Vāsavadattā going away from him and says to Vidūṣaka who enters at the moment: वयस्य ! प्रियमावेदये । धरते खलु वासवदत्ता । and by way of explanation repeats the verse in question.[4]

The context is admirably suited for the verse and pleads guilty to the charge of the sentiment (*rasa*) being subservient to the figure (*alaṁkāra*), as "the occasion after the dream when the king actually saw for the first time that his beloved wife was alive was certainly an occasion fit for an outburst of an uncontrollable sentiment and not for a poor and plodding metaphor".[5]

---

1 H. Sastri, *MASI*, 28, pp. 10-11 ; A. K. Pisharoti, *Criticism*, pp. 14-15; Bhattanatha, *IA*, 45, pp. 190-192; Kane, *VJV*, 1920, p. 100; *Bhāvaprakāśana*, GOS, No. 40, Intr. p. 47. 2 G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, p. 19; Harihar Sastri, *IHQ*, 1, p. 375; *JOR*, 2, pp. 216-217; Hirananda Sastri, *MASI*, 28, p. 11; Bhattanatha Swami, *IA*, 45, p. 190; Winternitz (on other grounds), *Problems*, p. 125; Thomas, *JRAS*, 1922, p. 81; *JRAS*, 1925, p. 104; Dr. Thomas has changed his opinion later on (*JRAS*, 1928, pp. 985-989). 3 *Alaṁkāra*, Intr, p. 24. 4 *Svapna*, p. 11. 5 Paranjape, *Pratimā*, Intr, p. XIX. The context for the verse is:—

राजा—वयस्य ! प्रियमावेदये । धरते खलु वासवदत्ता ।
सञ्चितपक्ष्मकवाटं नयनद्वारं सरूपतडनेन ।
उद्घाट्य सा प्रविष्टा हृदयगृहं मे नृपतनूजा ॥ (*Svapna*, p. 112.)

according to Dhruva, *Svapna upar nave prakaś*, Ahm., 1927, pp. 9-10; Paranjape, *Pratimā*, Intr. pp. XVII-XX; Raja, *ZII*, 2, p. 257; *JOR*, I, pp. 231-233; Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, pp. 142, 272-278;-the verse may find a place in the printed text at the context given above. Mr. Sankar (*AMV*, 2, p. 46) however, places it after *Svapna* VI. 1.

The omission of the verse from our text seems to be due to the scribe's mistake or probably the verse is purposely ousted in deference to the criticism levelled against it. In any way, it is too much to argue that Abhinavagupta is quoting from another *Svapna*, merely on the ground of the omission of a single verse, which can be explained. This does not, at any rate, prove that there have been very serious alterations in the text. The evidence of the *Śākuntala*, *Uttararāma carita*, as also of *Macbeth* are quite in point.

BHOJADEVA

in the 12th Prakāśa of his *Śṛigāraprakāśa* states :

स्वप्नवासवदत्ते पद्मावतीमस्वस्थां द्रष्टुं राजा समुद्गगृहकं गतः । पद्मावतीरहितं च तदवलोक्य तस्या एव शयनीये सुप्तवाप । वासवदत्तां च स्वप्नवदन्तरे ददर्श । स्वप्नायमानश्च वासवदत्तामाबभाषे । स्वप्नशब्देन चेह स्वापो वा स्वप्नदर्शनं वा स्वप्नान्तिकं वा विवक्षितम् ।

mentioning some incidents from a *Svapna*. These incidents, it will be readily admitted, closely resemble the events described in the fifth act of our text, testifying at the same time to our text being the same as known to Bhojadeva.

ŚĀRADĀTANAYA

in the eighth Adhikāra of his *Bhāvaprakāśa* illustrates Praśānta Nāṭaka by discussing in detail the entire plot of a *Svapna*.[1] It is admitted on all hands that our

---

1 GOS, No. 40, pp. 238-239 :—

प्रशान्तरसभूयिष्ठं प्रशान्तं नाम नाटकम् ।
न्यासो न्याससमुद्भेदो बीजोक्तिर्बीजदर्शनम् ॥
ततोऽनुद्दिष्टसंहारः प्रशान्ते पञ्च सन्धयः ।
सात्वती वृत्तिरत्र स्यादिति द्रौहिणिरब्रवीत् ॥
स्वप्नवासवदत्ताख्यमुदाहरणमत्र तु ।
आच्छिद्य भूपाद् व्यसनाद् देवी मागधिकाकरे ।
न्यस्ता यतस्ततो न्यासान्मुखसन्धिरयं भवेत् ॥
न्यासस्य च प्रतिमुखं समुद्भेद उदाहृतम् ।
पद्मावत्या मुखं वीक्ष्य विशेषकविभूषितम् ।
जीवत्यावन्तिकेरयेतज्ज्ञातं भूमिभुजा यथा ॥
उत्कण्ठितेन सोद्वेगं बीजोक्तिनामधेयेन ।
यदि वासवदत्तेति क्व वासीत्यादि दृश्यते ॥
सद्भावस्थितयोरेकं प्राप्यान्यस्य गवेषणम् ।
दर्शनास्पर्शनालापैरतस्याद् बीजदर्शनम् ॥
(अत्रोदाहरणम्)
चिरप्रसुप्तः कामो मे वीणया प्रतिबोधितः ।

text generally answers in structure and quotation, the details given by Śāradātanaya. There are some inconsistencies of a minor character, but they can be explained on the assumption of different recensions of the play. Thus, e. g. the verse

पद्मावत्या मुखं वीक्ष्य विशेषकविभूषितम् ।
जीवत्यावन्तिकेत्येतज्ज्ञातं भूमिभुजा यया ॥

does not occur in the extant work. But a similar incident is found in our *Svapna* and the verse has been assigned a proper place. Dr. Sarup thinks that the situation is contained in the portrait-incident in our text.[1] It seems rather to be a far-fetched interpretation, and the two are not similar. Prof. Dhruva's attempt at getting the incident by amending Vidūṣaka's speech, has been rightly called "a wholly unwarranted emendation" by Prof. Devdhar.[2] Dr. Ganapati Sastri has shown that we should read the verse पद्मावत्या मुखं वीक्ष्य etc. after *Svapna*, V. 8 (शय्यायां० etc) in our text.[3] The last *pāda* of the verse is required to be changed into एव पुरा मया । The change seems to have been made by Śāradātanaya to suit his context.

Śāradātanaya's testimony would thus be found quite insufficient to postulate the existence of another *Svapna*.

तां तु देवीं न पश्यामि यस्या वीक्षवती प्रिया ॥ (*Svapna*, VI. 3.)
किं ते भूयः प्रिय कुर्यामिति वाक्यव नोच्यते ।
तमनुद्दिश्यैव रमिस्यादुभैरतादयः ॥

1 *Vision*, Intr, p. 29. The incident referred to is :—

धात्री—पेक्खदु पेक्खदु भट्टिदारिआ । [चित्रफलकं दर्शयति]

पद्मावती (दृष्ट्वा आत्मगतम्)—इं अदिसदिसी सु इअं अय्याए आवन्तिकाए । (प्रकाशम्) अय्यउत्त सदिसी सु इअं अय्याए ।

राजा—न सदृशी । सैवेति मन्ये ।.....

पद्मावती—अय्यउत्तस्स पडिकिदिं पेक्खिअ जाणामि इअं अय्याए सदिसी ण वेत्ति ।

धात्री—पेक्खदु पेक्खदु भट्टिदारिआ ।

पद्मावती (दृष्ट्वा)—अय्यउत्तस्स पडिकिदीए सदिसत्ताए जाणामि इअं अय्याए सदिसित्ति ।

राजा—देवि चित्रदर्शनात्प्रभृति यष्टोद्विग्नामिव त्वां पश्यामि । किमिदम् ।

पद्मावती—अय्यउत्त इमाए पडिकिदीए सदिसी इह एव पडिवसदि ।

राजा—किं वासवदत्तायाः ।

पद्मावती—आम ।

(*Vision*, Text. pp. 57-58)

2 Dhruva, *Svapna upar nam prakas*, p. 10; Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, p. 58.
3 *Svapna*, (p. 113) commentary. See also Sankar, *AMV*, 2, p. 48.

It only shows that there were different recensions of the *Svapna*, and our text represents a different recension to that used by Śāradātanaya. Similar omissions are found in the Southern editions of the *Śākuntala* and *Meghadūta*, etc.[1]

SARVĀNANDA

in his *Amarakośaṭīkāsarvasva* mentions three divisions of *Śṛṅgāra*, viz. *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma śṛṅgāra*.[2] '*Nandayanti*' is cited as an instance of the first, and the third has been exemplified in a *Svapna* by the marriage of Udayana with Vāsavadattā. Thus, Sarvānanda apparently says that the *Svapna* is concerned with the marriage of Udayana with Vāsavadattā, and as our text deals with Udayana's marriage with Padmāvatī, Bhattanatha Swami, Pisharotis, and others declare our text as spurious and only an actors' version.[3] But, it will be seen that the quotation is rather defective and faulty, in that it mentions *artha-śṛṅgāra* but leaves out of account the example therefor. "Editorial pruning" is therefore necessary to give symmetry and completeness to the quotation ;[4] it requires the transposition of a single word viz. स्वप्नवासवदत्ते before तृतीयः, and reading तत्रैव for तस्यैव. Thus the quotation would read :

...द्वितीयः स्वदिगमात्मसात्कर्तुमुदयनस्य पद्मावतीपरिणयोऽर्थशृङ्गारः
स्वप्नवासवदत्ते । तृतीयस्तत्रैव वासवदत्तापरिणयः कामशृङ्गारः ।

Further, Bhojadeva, Śāradātanaya and Sāgaranandin (as we shall presently see) concur in making Padmāvatī's marriage, the theme of the *Svapna*. Hence Dr. Ganapati Sastri's emendation "is an a *priori* solution of the difficulty".[4] So the *Svapna* illustrates *artha-śṛṅgāra* (political marriage).

That the *Svapna* includes *kāma-śṛṅgāra* has been

---

1 In the *Śākuntala* the following verses among others are omitted in the Southern recensions ; I. 10 न खलु न खलु बाणः etc (Ray's edition, 1935, pp. 90-91) ; कुलपतिभोभिः पवमचपवैः etc (ib. p.102) ; कण्वोत्सुकते महति etc. (ib. p. 337) ; also pp. 341-344 (3 verses). Srirangam Edn. of the *Meghadūta* based on the commentary of Pūrnasarasvati omits ten verses which formed part of the poem in 800 A. D. 2 त्रिविधः शृङ्गारः धर्मार्थकामभिन्नः । तत्राद्यो यथा नन्दयन्त्यां ब्रह्मणमोजनम् । द्वितीयः स्वदिगात्मसात्कर्तुमुदयनस्य पद्मावतीपरिणयोऽर्थशृङ्गारः । तृतीयः स्वप्नवासवदत्ते तस्यैव वासवदत्तापरिणयः कामशृङ्गारः ।

3 Bhattanatha, *IA*, 45, p. 190 ; A.K. Pisharoti, *Criticism*, pp. 14-15. K. R. Pisharoti, *IHQ*, 1, p. 106. 4 G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, p. 19 ; Harihar Sastri, *I HQ*, 1, pp. 374-375; Sankar, *AMV*, 2, p. 47 ; Sarup, *Vision*, Intr., pp. 25-27. 5 Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 142.

shown by referring to the dream-scene, but it does not refer to Vāsavadattā-pariṇaya ;[1] therefore, according to Dr. Sarup, Dhātrī's speech in the sixth act referring to the romantic marriage of Vāsavadattā illustrates *kāma-śṛṅgāra* (love marriage).[2] Sarvānanda's quotation being thus quite reasonably explicable, it cannot help to proclaim our text as spurious or stage version.

The most important evidence throwing a flood of light over the authorship of *Svapna* is the one from the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* of

RĀMACANDRA AND GUNACANDRA,

first given by Dr. Lévi in JA, 1923, p. 197 (foot-note). It runs :

यथा भासकृते स्वप्नवासवदत्ते शेफालिकाशिलातलमवलोक्य वत्सराजः—

पादाक्रान्तानि पुष्पाणि सोष्म चेदं शिलातलम् ।
नूनं काचिदिहासीना मां दृष्ट्वा सहसा गता ॥ (V. L. गता)[3]

The words भासकृते preceding स्वप्नवासवदत्ते in the above quotation are used, according to Dr. Lévi, to distinguish it from another *Svapna* by a different author. There are no instances of two dramatic works being docketted by the same title as was pointed out above.[4] The term भासकृत was prefixed to the word Svapnavāsavadatta as the public were unfamiliar "with the play or its authorship".[5] That it does not presuppose another *Svapna* is proved by the fact that the same treatise describes the *Mṛcch* as शूद्रकविरचितम्, which could not have been appended to distinguish it from the *Daridra Cārudatta* which is already distinct.

Now, the printed *Svapna* does not contain the above verse (and also the context, according to Dr. Lévi) and hence it is not the 'authentic' *Svapna* according to Dr. Lévi, nor is it by Bhāsa. We shall see whether it can find any place in the printed drama. It will be seen that it can occur, if at all, in the fourth act of the play, where Dr. Lévi finds 'dislocated' elements of the original Bhāsa scene. Dr. Sukthankar has explained the situation in detail and

1 Cf. Raja, *JOR*, 1, p. 238, says that Vāsavadattā-parinaya might have formed the concluding portion of the real *Svapna*; but, as we shall show later on, there is only one *Svapna*, represented by the printed text. 2 Sarup, *Vision*, Intr. p. 27. The context is on p. 133 of the *Svapna*; *Vision of Vāsavadattā*, Text, p. 57. Mr. Sankar, however, leaves *Kāma-śṛṅgāra* without an example, as no example was needed, it being a common theme of most Sanskrit plays. *IHQ*, 2, p. 47. 3 *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, GOS. No. 48, p. 84. 4 Thomas, *JRAS*, 1925, pp. 106-107; Winternitz, *CR*, December 1924, p. 341. 5 Thomas, *JRAS*, 1925, p. 101; cf. Lévi, *JA*, 1923, p. 199.

has rightly concluded that the verse may occur after तत्तओदी पदुमावदी इह आअच्छिअ णिग्गदा भवे (p. 72) as—राजा (सेफालिका-शिलातलमवलोक्य)—पादाक्रान्तानि० etc. (*Svapna*, IV.2a).[1] That is the right place for the verse, and after what Dr. Sukthankar has written about it, we deem it unnecessary to cover the same ground. There is no great "dislocation"—no lacuna of the elements of the original scene. All that is needed is the replacement of the verse at a point where there is a hiatus in our version.

Dr. Raja objects to the above suggestion on the ground of the repetition of the king's speech by the jester.[2] We see no repetition of the sense of the king's speech in the jester's remarks. The jester observes the plucking and gathering of flowers, while the king refers to the crushing of flowers. The jester's inference as to the lady being Padmāvatī stands to reason, because what he means to say is that the royal pleasure-garden being rather under the exclusive control of Padmāvatī, none but her ladyship alone would collect flowers from her *śephālikā* bower.

Dr. Raja recasts some of the passages and gives his version of how the scene might have read originally. Prof. Dhruva also tries a similar device as the text is त्रुटित according to him.[3] We find that no such emendations are necessary. The verse is simply to be placed in the context. MM. Dr. G. Sastri places the verse at *Svapna*, p. 45, but the context there does not suit the verse.

The usual mistake of the scribe or the ultra-cleverness of some hyper-critical Kerala Paṇḍita is responsible for the loss of the verse from the text. Instances of changes in the Northern and Southern recensions of the same MS are not rare, and the absence of a verse or two is not a sufficient reason for arguing the existence of a different text by a different author. The above quotation from the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* leaves no doubt as to the authorship of Bhāsa of the *Svapna*, and if our text is proved to be identical with the *Svapna* that we read of in the Sanskrit literature (which by now we have sufficiently proved) the whole series of thirteen dramas published in the T. S. S. will have to be ascribed to Bhāsa.

---

1 *JBBRAS*, 1925, pp. 155-157, 271-272; Lévi, *JA*, 1923, pp. 198-199.
2 *JOR*, I, p. 236. 3 Raja, *JOR*, I, p. 236; Dhruva, *Svapna upar nāno prakāś*, pp. 6-7.

Dr. Lévi, in the same article, refers to another treatise on dramaturgy quoting an extract therefrom bearing on the present question.

SĀGARANANDIN

in his *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa* while discussing the manner of transition from the prologue to the main scene, apparently cites from a *Svapnavāsavadatta*.[1]—यथा स्वप्नवासवदत्ते, नेपथ्ये सूत्रधारः (उत्सारणां श्रुत्वा पठति)। अये कथं तपोवनेऽप्युत्सारणा। (विलोक्य) कथं मन्त्री यौगन्धरायणो वत्सराजस्य राज्यप्रत्यानयनं कर्तुकामः पद्मावतीयज्ञनेनोत्सार्यते। इत्युत्सारणाशब्दोऽत्र पूर्वकप्रयोगमुत्सार्य नाटकार्थसूचक इति प्रयोगातिशयः।

This does not tally with the printed text. There the prologue is worded thus: सूत्रधारः—अज्ज पस्यामि।

(नेपथ्ये) उस्सरह उस्सरह। अय्या! उस्सरह।

सूत्रधारः—भवतु, विज्ञातम्।

भृत्यैर्मगधराजस्य स्निग्धैः कन्यानुगामिभिः।
एष्टमुत्सार्यते सर्वैस्तपोवनगतो जनः॥

On account of the difference between the two, Dr. Lévi, Prof. Pisharoti and others regard our text with suspicion as an adaptation.[2] Dr. Raja finds in Sāgaranandin a support for the particular meaning he attaches to the expression सूत्रधारकृतारम्भत्व[3]. MM. Dr. G. Sastri, Dr. Thomas, Dr. Sukthankar, Prof. Dhruva and others on the other hand, explain the difference on the ground that Sāgaranandin was quoting from memory or giving in his own words the contents of the *prastāvanā* or quoting from a variant text.[4]

The above assumptions, especially that of stating in his own words, seem to be confirmed by the wording of the quotation, e. g. such words as पद्मावतीय, नेपथ्ये सूत्रधारः, उत्सारणां श्रुत्वा in place of the usual पद्मावतीजन, नेपथ्ये उत्सारणां श्रुत्वा सूत्रधारः etc. The extract from the *Śākuntalavyākhyā* which will be considered next, also shows that Sāgaranandin was stating the contents of the *sthāpanā* in his own words. The two extracts discovered by Dr. Lévi show that our Trivandrum play is a Southern recension of the drama of *Bhāsa*.[5] Finally, we come to

---

1 Lévi *JA*, 1923, p. 217. *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa*, edited by M. Dillon, has recently been published by the Oxford University Press (London, 1937). This quotation occurs in that work on p. 51. 2 Lévi, *JA*, 1923, pp. 179-217; Pisharoti, *IHQ*, 1, p. 108; Devdhar, *Plays etc*, p. 60; Hirananda, *MASI*, 28, p. 11. 3 *JOR*, 1, p. 287. 4 G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, pp. 117-118; Thomas, *JRAS*, 1925, p. 103; 1928, p. 878; Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 275; Dhruva, *Svapna upar uttaro prabāṣ*, pp. 5-6. 5 Sarup, *Vision*, Intr. pp. 29-35; Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, pp. 137-138, 274-276.

referred to above. It refers (p. 30) to the *prastāvanā* of a *Svapna* in identical words as are found in our text—यथा स्वप्नवासवदत्तायाम्—एवमार्यमिश्रान् विज्ञापयामि । अये ! किन्नु खलु मयि विज्ञापनव्यग्रे शब्द इव श्रूयते । अङ्गं पश्यामि । (नेपथ्ये) उस्सरह उस्सरह अथवा उस्सरह । etc. We thus find that this writer was familiar with the southern recension of Bhāsa, which is identical with the printed text, and that our conclusion that differences in quotations are due to different versions of the same text is supported.

Direct references to the *Svapna*, so far as we know, are all given above. All of them refer to one and the same *Svapna*, and the printed text represents a southern recension of the same in some cases. Thus, Abhinavagupta refers to the second and fifth act of our play, Bhojadeva to the fifth, Śāradātanaya to the first, fourth, fifth and sixth, Sarvānanda to the third, fourth and fifth, Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra to the fourth, and Sāgaranandin and *Śākuntalavyākhyā* to the prologue of our play.[2] All the references being found in the printed text, there is no ground to support multiplicity of the *Svapna* by different authors. The *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* mentions in clear and unmistakable terms, Bhāsa as the author of the *Svapna*, which we have proved to be identical with our text.

Some quotations from the printed *Svapna* are found in works of different rhetoricians and authors without mentioning either its name or that of its author. Daṇḍin in his *Kāvyādarśa* (II. 280), without mentioning the work or the author, quotes the following :—

मृतेति प्रेत्य संगन्तुं यया मे मरणं मतम् ।
सैषावन्ती मया लब्धा कथमत्रैव जन्मनि ॥

Though this does not occur in the *Svapna* nor has it been specifically assigned by its author to a *Svapna*, we are inclined to think that it might have belonged to the northern recension of our play. Its place in our text is after VI. 17.[3]

Nearly all the above citations, direct as well as in-

1 *IHQ.* 5, pp. 721-728; R. No. 2778 in Govt. Oriental MSS Library, Madras. *Śākuntalavyākhyā* quotes from the *Cār, Dyh, Pañc, Bāl, Svapna, and Avi.* 2 Dhruva, *Svapna upar nava prakāś*, pp. 4-6. 3 Lindenau (*DS*, p. 13) and Devdhar (*Plays etc.* p. 61) mention only the stanza by Daṇḍin. It probably formed part of the King's speech, after *Svapna*, VI. 17. (p. 141) : न खलु स्वप्नोऽयम् । सत्यमेवेदम् । मृतेति प्रेत्य संगन्तुं etc. (*Kāvyādarśa*, II. 280)

direct, postulate the existence of one *Svapna* only, and that also from Bhāsa. Some authors, notably Abhinavagupta, Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, Sarvānanda etc., seem to militate against the unity of the *Svapna*, but "the most that can be made out from these facts against the ascription to Bhāsa is simply that there were probably varying recensions of the plays".[1]

Having ascribed the *Svapna* to Bhāsa on the authority of the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, further evidence in support is to be considered. That is supplied by

RĀJAŚEKHARA

who in his *Sūktimuktāvali* states :

भासनाटकचक्रेऽपि छेकैः क्षिप्ते परीक्षितुम् ।
स्वप्नवासवदत्तस्य दाहकोऽभून्न पावकः ॥

The wording, expression and sense of the verse is so simple that it need not detain us long. It says: when critics subjected the cycle of Bhāsa's dramas to the test of fire ordeal, fire did not burn the *Svapna*. It thus speaks of two things: Bhāsa wrote a number of dramas and the *Svapna* was one of them. The idea of a rival *Svapna* worked out by Dr. Raja[2] on the strength of this stanza is, as noted by G. Harihar Sastri, absurd for a number of reasons.[3]

Leaving aside the question of the authenticity of the quotation for a moment, we think it will be acceptable that the meaning is quite clear that "the *Svapna* of Bhāsa survived exposure to the fire of criticism, when his dramas were exposed to the ordeal by experts".[4] This is confirmed by the tradition recorded in the *Pṛthvirāja-vijaya*, and its commentary.[5]

Messrs. Pisharotis, Dr. Raja and others, have tried to reduce the statement of Rājaśekhara to an absurdity by quoting stanzas from *Kavivimarśa* alleged to be from Rājaśekhara, which identify Bhāsa (the pre-Kālidāsan poet) with Dhāvaka (a post-Kālidāsan poet) and credit

1 Keith, *HSL*, p. XV. 2 *JOR*, I. p. 227. It is interesting to see how Dr. Raja comes to the meaning : Bhāsa's dramas contained conflagration scenes. These fires burnt all other dramas (i. e. excelled them) ; but *Svapna* alone remained safe. So according to this interpretation the *Svapna* was a rival to Bhāsa's works. 3 *JOR*, 2, p. 216. 4 Keith, *HSL*, p. XIII. 5 *Pṛthvirājacarita*, 1. 8. भासस्य काव्यं खलु विष्णुपर्यन्तोऽप्यानन्दात्तत्वन्मुमोच । Sankar, *AMV*, 2, p. 43; G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, App. II (b).

him with the authorship of the *Priyadarśikā*, *Ratnāvali*, *Nāgānanda*, *Udāttarāghava*, *Kiraṇāvali* and *Svapnavāsavadatta*.[1]

The context of the verses in the *Kavivimarśa* has been shown by Messrs. Sesha Iyer, G. Harihar Sastri to be a recent forgery, and Dr. Keith accepts the conclusion taking the forgery as "gross and palpable".[2]

The extract from the *Kavivimarśa* is a patchwork of truth and falsehood. The spuriousness of the stanzas would be evident from the curious statements they make, *e.g. Kiraṇāvali*, a work on logic by Udayanācārya, is a tragedy of Bhāsa, and *Udāttarāghava* also is a Nāṭaka of Bhāsa. There is no reference to *Kavivimarśa* in the whole of Sanskrit literature.[3]

It seems that some Pandit, in imitation of the genuine stanzas of Rājaśekhara, composed verses in praise of Dhāvaka and inserted the genuine Rājaśekhara stanza *viz.* भासनाटकचक्रेऽपि० etc. in them.[4]

In condemning the extract as fraudulent and spurious, the stanza भासनाटकचक्रेऽपि० etc. cannot be dismissed

---

1 K. R. Pisharoti, *IHQ*, 1, pp. 105–106; *IHQ*, 5, pp. 552–554; A. K. Pisharoti, *Criticism*, pp. 13–14; Raja, *JOR*, 1, pp. 226–227. The stanzas are:

कारणं तु कवित्वस्य न सम्पन्न कुलीनता ।
पावकोऽपि हि यद् भासः कलीनामग्रिमोऽभवत् ॥
आदौ भासेन रचिता नाटिका प्रियदर्शिका ।
निरीक्ष्यैव रसज्ञस्य कस्य न प्रियदर्शना ॥
तस्य रत्नावली नूनं रत्नमालेव राजते ।
दक्षकण्ठकलामिन्वा वक्षस्यल्पान्तशोभना ॥
नागानन्दे समालोक्य यस्य श्रीहर्षविक्रमः ।
समुद्दानन्दमरितः स्वसम्भवमकरोत्कविम् ॥
उदात्तरावबं नूनमुदात्तरसगुम्फितम् ।
यद्वीक्ष्य भवभूत्याद्याः प्रतिस्पर्द्धीन्यनि वै ॥
शोकपर्यवसाना वा नवाङ्का किरणावली ।
माकन्दस्येव कस्याश्च मदयति न निर्वृतिम् ॥
भासनाटकचक्रेऽपि छेकैः क्षिप्ते परीक्षितुम् ।
स्वप्नवासदत्तस्य दाहलेऽभून्न पावकः ॥

2 Sesha Iyer, *IHQ*, 1, p. 361; G. Harihar Sastri, *IHQ*, 1, pp. 370–378; Keith, *HSL*, p. XIV. "Dr. Sukthankar's acceptance (in JBRAS, 1925) of this foolish and obvious forgery is regrettably uncritical". Keith, *HSL*, p. XIV. 3 *Cf.* Bhattanatha, Māyūraja, *IA*, 41, pp. 141–142; G. Harihar Sastri, *IHQ*, 1, p. 372; also bhūmikā to *Priyadarśikā* by Krishnamacharya, pp. XXV. to XXVI. 4 Genuine stanzas collected by Peterson in *JBRAS*, 17, pp. 57–71. The composer of the stanzas is said to be Narayana Sastri (Potti's Intr. to *Avi.*). *Cf.* also Sesha Iyer, *IHQ*, 1, p. 361.

as a 'forgery', "of doubtful authority", and "proving nothing";[1] its authenticity has been proved by the independent evidence of the *Sūktimuktāvali* of Jalhaṇa (12th Century A.D.), where it is definitely ascribed to Rājaśekhara.

Assuming that the whole context, alleged to be from the *Kavivimarśa viz.* **कारणं तु कवित्वस्य** etc., is a genuine one, we shall see whether any meaning can be extracted from it. Dr. Sarup tries to bridge over the absurdity by noting the tradition that makes Dhāvaka a contemporary of Śrī Harṣa and the real author of the works that pass off as Śrī Harṣa's. Dr. Sarup takes 'Bhāsa' in the verses preceding **भासनाटकचक्रेऽपि०** etc. to mean 'illustrious', and translates: "Neither wealth nor noble descent can account for poetic power, for the illustrious (*Bhāsa*) Dhāvaka became the foremost of poets. By the illustrious (poet) (*Bhāsena*) was composed in the beginning a play called *Priyadarśikā* .....". 'Thus interpreted,' says Dr. Sarup, 'the passage neither clouds the reliability of Rājaśekhara's statement nor gives any indication of the existence of two Bhāsas'.[2] The interpretation, however, appears to be unsatisfactory and far from convincing.

We think that the extract compares Dhāvaka with Bhāsa. In the two genuine Rājaśekhara stanzas, viz. **सरस्वतीपरिग्रहाणां०** etc. and **अहो प्रभावो वाग्देव्याः** etc., the poet has compared a potter (*kulāla*) Droṇa to Vyāsa, a *mātaṅga* (untouchable) Divākara to Bāṇa and Mayūra, and similarly a washerman Dhāvaka to Bhāsa.[3] Now the tradition ascribing the authorship of the *Priyadarśikā*, *Nāgānanda* etc. has been shown to be genuine and a long-standing one.[4] The comparison of Dhāvaka with Bhāsa seems to have been instituted on account of the modelling of the *Priyadarśikā* and *Ratnāvalī* on the *Svapna*

---

1 K. Rama Pisharoti, *IHQ*, 5, pp. 553-554. 2 Vision, Intr., pp.21-25.

3
सरस्वतीपरिग्रहाणां भासिरत्र न देहिनाम्।
श्वासतर्षी कुलालेऽभूद् द्रोणो भारते कविः॥
अहो प्रभावो वाग्देव्या यन्मातङ्गदिवाकरः।
श्रीहर्षसाभवत्सभ्यः सभो बाणमयूरयोः॥

4 *IHQ*, 1, p. 373; Sarup, Vision, Intr., pp. 22-23; Paranjape, *Sāhityasaṅgraha*, I, pp. 141-186. Prof. Paranjape worked out the parallelisms and analogies between the *Priyadarśikā*, *Ratnāvalī* and *Nāgānanda* on the one hand and the Trivandrum Bhāsa plays on the other, to prove Bhāsa's authorship of all these works. The whole attempt, however, is already discredited as subversive of the accepted chronology of Indian writers.

and *Pratijñā* of the latter. Bhāsa in भावकोऽपि हि यद् भासः, we translate as भासः इव (as if Bhāsa; like the genuine Bhāsa) and in the next stanzas (आदौ भासेन etc.), the poet apparently identifies Bhāsa with Dhāvaka; but the previous stanzas referring to a *kulāla* Droṇa and a *mātaṅga* Divākara remind us that the *modern* Dhāvaka is compared with *ancient* Bhāsa. The last stanza भासनाटकचक्रेऽपि etc. brings together all the works of Bhāsa (the ancient, as well as modern, *i. e.*, including the works of Dhāvaka) and pronounces its judgment in favour of the *Svapna*.

Thus we find that in either case, Rājaśekhara's statement testifies to Bhāsa's authorship, among a number of dramas, of the *Svapna*.

This testimony of Rājaśekhara, coupled with that of the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, conclusively proves Bhāsa's authorship of the *Svapna*.

BĀṆA

in the introductory stanzas to his *Harṣacarita* mentions some of the characteristics of Bhāsa's dramas:

सूत्रधारकृतारम्भैर्नाटकैर्बहुभूमिकैः ।
सप्ताङ्कैर्यशो लेभे भासो देवकुलैरिव ॥

Cowell and Thomas have translated the verse: "Bhāsa gained as much splendour by his plays with introductions spoken by the manager, full of various characters and furnished with startling episodes, as he would have done by the erection of temples, created by architects, adorned with several storeys and decorated with banners".[1] A hot controversy has raged over the interpretation, meaning and significance as also the applicability of this stanza, and we shall consider it in parts सूत्रधारकृतारम्भैः, बहुभूमिकैः and सप्ताङ्कैः ।

The statement सूत्रधारकृतारम्भैः which has been mentioned as a characteristic of Bhāsa, *prima facie* applies to the Trivandrum plays as they are begun by the Sūtradhāra after the performance of *nāndi* in the green-room. (नान्द्यन्ते ततः प्रविशति सूत्रधारः) It is to be noted in this connection that we are not proving the authorship or authenticity of the Trivandrum plays on this statement of

1 *Harṣacarita*, trans. Cowell and F. W. Thomas, London, 1897, p. 3.

Bāṇa, but we are confirming our conclusion, already arrived at from the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* and Rājaśekhara.

In their enthusiasm to 'kill' Bhāsa,[1] many scholars have unfortunately lost sight of the clear issues and have brought in much that is irrelevant and that obscures the problem; some of the protagonists also have fallen into the same pit.

It is said, that if the stage direction नान्यन्ते ततः प्रविशति सूत्रधारः be taken as characterizing Bhāsa's works, the number of such works would be infinite. Many of the South Indian plays such as the *Tapatisamvaraṇa*, *Subhadrādhanañjaya*, *Mattavilāsa*, *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi*, *Caturbhāṇi* etc. and Southern MSS of Kālidāsa, Harṣa, Viśākhadatta etc. also begin in the same way. Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti has further strengthened his position by adducing MS evidence. The expression नान्यन्ते० etc. is thus said to be vitiated by *ativyāpti*, as it extends to a number of Sanskrit dramas that are definitely known to be by other writers.

Now, the statement by Bāṇa must evidently be taken to refer to the works written either before his time, or at best contemporaneous with him. It would be absurd to suppose that Bāṇa was "presuming to give the characteristics of plays which were to be written after his death".[2] Thus all the South Indian plays fall out of the list. Again, these and the Southern MSS of Kālidāsa, Harṣa etc. are quite distinct and need no inference as to their authorship from नान्यन्ते etc, on account of the names of their authors being mentioned in explicit terms. So, if at all, the *ativyāpti* would cover the *Bhagavadajjukīya*, *Traivikrama* and *Dāmaka Prahasana*.[3] Of these, the first has been shown to be by Bodhāyana; and *Traivikrama*, apparently later than Bāṇa's time being composed in the middle of the twelfth century, has been ascribed to a Cākyār, possibly Nīlakaṇṭha, by K. Rama Pisharoti. As to *Dāmaka*, Dr. Jolly has proved it, as we shall subsequently see, to be a compilation by Cākyārs.[4] Thus, the statement नान्यन्ते etc

---

1 Barnett, *BSOS*, 4, p. 631. 2 Paranjape, *Pratimā*, Intr. p. XIII. 3 Hirananda Sastri, *MASI*,28, pp. 4-6; A. K. Pisharoti, *Criticism*, pp. 8-12; Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, pp. 42-44; K. Rama Pisharoti, *IHQ*, 1, pp. 333-334; *BSOS*, 6, pp. 819-821; Barnett, *JRAS*, 1921, pp. 87-89. 4 *Bhagavadajjukīyam*, Intn., by Achan and preface by Winternitz; Pisharoti, *Sharma'a*, 1924, pp. 213-223; Jolly, *Festgabe Garbe*, pp. 115-121.

is not wide enough as is contended.

In this connection, the presence of the same peculiarity of नान्यन्ते etc in the *Mattavilāsa* of Mahendravikramavarman furnishes us with some interesting information which, though strictly not relevant here, is given here on account of its importance. From the dates generally ascribed to Bāṇa and Mahendravikramavarman both appear to be contemporaries; it is not clear who was the senior of the two. Now, Bāṇa refers to the state of affairs of his time. If he is earlier than Mahendravikrama, there is no doubt as to his statement applying only to Bhāsa. But if Bāṇa is later than Mahendravikrama there are two possibilities: either the MSS of the *Mattavilāsa* in Bāṇa's time might have read differently, or if the MSS read नान्यन्ते etc. as now, Bāṇa must be taken to have known for certain that Bhāsa was the pioneer in that field, for Bāṇa cannot be taken to include a contemporary work among Bhāsa's works. It may be asked why we do not dismiss the *Mattavilāsa* from the list, as in the case of others, on account of its being ascribed to a definite author. But the *Mattavilāsa* stands distinct from the other MSS in that it is contemporaneous with Bāṇa, and Bāṇa does not mention कविनामविवर्जितैः as a characteristic of Bhāsa. The natural inference from this is that Bhāsa MSS in Bāṇa's time did contain the name of the author in their *prastāvanā* or *sthāpanā*; and therefore, that the present *sthāpanās* are, as Dr. Sukthankar and Prof. Dhruva seem to suggest, mutilated and contain some later additions.[1] The portion containing the name of the author and the piece in the *prastāvanā* which existed in Bāṇa's time is now not to be seen. If the changes be due to some uniform process worked in the South, MSS of Bhāsa if unearthed in the North will, it is hoped, solve the problem conclusively.

Further, much is sought to be made of the testimony of Viśvanātha of the fifteenth century, who observes in connection with the position of *Nāndi* and *Sūtradhāra* :—

अतएव प्राक्तनपुस्तकेषु 'नान्यन्ते सूत्रधारः' इत्यनन्तरमेव 'वेदान्तेषु-' इत्यादि श्लोकलिखनं दृश्यते। यच्च पश्चात् 'नान्यन्ते सूत्रधारः' इति लिखनं तस्याथमभिप्रायः—नान्यन्ते सूत्रधार इदं प्रयोजितवान्, इतः प्रभृति नाटकमुपादीपत इति कवेरभिप्रायः सूचित इति।

1 Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 188; Dhruva, *Svapna upar nava prakāś*, pp. 6-11. Also, Sarup, *Vision*, Intr., p. 28; Thomas, *JRAS*, 1928, pp. 877, 899.

(p. 63, Prof. Kane's edition). The *Vikramorvaśīya* is here given as an instance of the practice of old MSS in deference to the views of some writer (**कश्चित्**). From the critical apparatus to Hillebrandt's edition of the *Mudrārākṣasa* we know that one of the very best MSS of the *Mudrārākṣasa* places the words **नान्द्यन्ते** etc. before the introductory stanza.[1] Viśvanātha notices herein an exceptional case. And an exception only proves the rule, even according to Viśvanātha, that the *recital of the Nāndī* and not the *entrance of the Sūtradhāra* commenced a play; and under these circumstances Bāṇa must have used the expression **सूत्रधारकृतारम्भैः** to distinguish Bhāsa's plays from others which followed the usual practice of a *Nāndī* beginning a play.[2]

In spite of the ingenious efforts by Dr. Banerji Sastri and Dr. Lindenau to show that **सूत्रधारकृतारम्भ** refers to the stage reform of Bhāsa, in combining the functions of the Sūtradhāra and the Sthāpaka, the shortening of the preliminaries and relegating them to the green-room, we think that the verse, in this sense, is merely descriptive and does not serve as signifying any special characteristic of Bhāsa.[3] Bāṇa wanted to compare Bhāsa's plays with temples—"in the same words with some not very obvious objects of comparison."[4] At the same time, we do not see in these words any special features of Bhāsa such as the Sūtradhāra taking part in the drama, as is maintained by Dr. Raja.[5]

To turn to the other *pādas* of the verse, Bāṇa has noted Bhāsa's dramas as **बहुनूमिक** and **सपताक**. As to both of these, Dr. Raja and others refuse to see numerous characters and episodes in these dramas.[6]

As to **बहुनूमिक** it may be said that Bāṇa uses the term taking into consideration the proportion of the length of the dramas to the number of characters, viz. small one act plays have comparatively many characters. Or perhaps it may be that Bāṇa means **बहुविधनूमिक** by it, and every one will endorse the view that our dramas

1 Konow, *IA*, 49, p. 234. 2 Paranjape, *Pratimā*, Intr., p. XIV. 3 Banerji Sastri, *JBAS*, 1921, pp. 368-369; Lindenau, *BS*, pp. 36, 37. 4 Keith, *SD*, p. 91; Cf. also Sukthankar, *JBBAS*, 1925, pp. 130-131; Raddi, *VJV*, 47, p. 212; Kane, *VJV*, 1920, p. 97. 5 *ZII*, 2, pp. 254-255; *JOR*, 1, pp. 228-230. We are inclined to take Bāṇa's statement as referring to the particular mode of opening adopted in the Bhāsa dramas which is generally uniform, viz. of the *Prayogātiśaya* type. 6 Raja, *ZII*, 2, pp. 255-256; Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, p. 44; Raddi, *VJV*, 47, pp. 212-213.

introduce characters of various types and vicissitudes.

It has been boldly asserted that there are no *patākās* in our collection of dramas.[1] True it is, that the episodes (*patākās*) in our dramas are not up to the standard of some of the best ones in literature, but that does not mean that they are not episodes, they are episodes all the same.[2] Instances are: the episode of Padmāvatīpariṇaya in the *Svapna*, Vālīvadha and Sugrīvakathā in the *Abh*, Vidūṣaka Kathā or Aṅgulikāvṛtta in the *Avi*, Sajjalaka-Madanikā Kathā in the *Cār*, Bharata Kathā in the *Prat*, Viṇā Kathānaka in the *Pratijñā*, and Saṅkarṣaṇa Kathā in the *Bāl*. Out of the one-act plays, the episode of the Brāhmaṇas may be taken as an instance of patākā from the *Mv*. It would thus be clear that nearly all the Trivandrum plays contain patākās and thus answer the description by Bāṇa.

Some take '*patākā*' to mean '*patākāsthānaka*';[3] but both are quite distinct terms and there is no chance of the one being mistaken for the other. Still, if *patākā* is taken to mean 'Dramatic irony', the instances of the latter given in the first Chapter (Sec. 4, *Patākāsthānaka*) will show that the term is applicable to our plays in that sense also.

Prof. Kane objects to the use of the term *Nāṭaka* for all the plays in our group as, according to him, the term applies only to the *Svapna*, *Bāl*, *Avi*, *Abh* and *Prat*.[4] But it should be noted, as has been observed by the same scholar, that Bāṇa was attempting a comparison in general terms, and further, the one-act plays also deserve to be called *Nāṭakas* in general.[5]

According to Prof. Ray by the comparison of Bhāsa-dramas with so many temples, "Bāṇa perhaps means to say that the dramas of Bhāsa were entitled to the same amount of veneration as is ordinarily reserved for a Devakula".[6] We think that Bāṇa has purposely used

---

1 Raja, *ZII*, 2, p.256; Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, p. 44; Kane, *VJV*, 1920, p. 102.

2 *Bharata Nāṭya Śāstra* XIX. 23

यद् वृत्तं हि परार्थं स्वप्रधानस्योपकारकम्।
प्रधानस्य फलस्येव सा पताकेति कीर्तिता॥

Also, *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, VI. 67. ख्यापि प्रासङ्गिकं वृत्तं पताकेत्यभिधीयते।

3 Hivargaokar, Marathi translation, Vol. I, p. 20; Ghatak, *JDL*, 12, p. 16.

4 *VJV*, 1920, p. 99. 5 Kane, *VJV*, 1920, p. 97; Dhruva, *Madhyama*, Intr., pp. 22-28; *Svapna*, Intr., pp. 20-22. 6 *Svapna*, Intr., p. XV.

the term 'Devakula' to convey the idea that there was an atmosphere of 'holiness', 'sublimity', round these Bhāsa-dramas, such as is associated with temples. Otherwise, he could very well have compared Bhāsa-dramas with 'palaces' (राजगृहैरिव) as all the epithets equally apply to royal palaces also. But as he intended to emphasize the holy, almost divine, halo attached to these dramas he employed the term 'temple' (देवकुल). The term applies to our dramas as they deal with noble subjects, high ideals, are didactic, and there is no trace of low morality or anything that would be deemed sacrilegious by even an orthodox Brahmin.

The whole verse सूत्रधारकृतारम्भैः etc. has thus been proved to be applicable in general to the Trivandrum plays. It has not been proved by those who doubt Bāṇa's statement that he was giving fanciful descriptions. His statements in the same context, concerning Pravarasena, Sātavāhana, etc. are found to be correct, and hence there is no reason why Bāṇa should not be trusted.

Thus it is that Bāṇa gives an additional chain to our evidence in linking the Trivandrum plays to Bhāsa.

VĀKPATIRĀJA (Eighth Century)

in his *Gaūdavaha*, v 800, describes Bhāsa as 'a friend of fire' (भासे डाहणमित्ते etc.). "The epithet" as Dr. Winternitz says, "would be extremely appropriate for our plays".[1] Dr. Banerji Sastri and Prof. Ghatak have given an exhaustive list of references from the dramas wherever the term 'fire' occurs—expressions such as fire of anger, sacrificial fire, etc. being included in the list.[2] It is neither necessary, nor correct, we think to go so far for proving the ज्वलनमित्रत्व of the author of the Trivandrum plays. The appearance of *Agni* in human form (*Abh*, VI. 24-27; *Avi*, IV. 8) as also the mention and description of conflagrations and fires in a number of these plays (*Pañc*, I. 6-19; *Bāl*, II. 24; *Dv*, 32; *Dgh*, 22; *Svapna*, Act I Lāvāṇaka Dahana)—are sufficient, it is hoped, to justify the epithet.

This also strengthens the conclusion of Bhāsa's authorship of the Trivandrum plays.

The next author, worth mention, referring to some

1 *Problems*, p. 122; *CR*, Dec. 1924, p. 341. 2 Banerji Sastri, *JRAS*, 1921, p. 380; Ghatak, *JDL*, 12, pp. 17-18.

peculiar feature of Bhāsa, is

JAYADEVA (1200 A. D.)

who in his *Prasannarāghava* says

यस्याश्चारुशिखिकुरुनिकुरः कर्णपूरो मयूरो
भासो हासः कविकुलगुरुः कालिदासो विलासः।
हर्षो हर्षो हृदयवसतिः पञ्चबाणस्तु बाणः
केषां नैषा भवति कविताकामिनी कौतुकाय॥

Bhāsa is here described as the 'Laughter of Poetry, (कविताकामिनी). Hāsa, in other words, means 'humour,' and there are many instances of boisterous (*Pratijña*, pp. 59-61) and quiet (*Prat*, p. 13; *Mv*, p. 22) humour in our plays.[1] Other examples are the scenes in which the characters of Santuṣṭa (*Avi*), Maitreya (*Cār*), Vasantaka (*Svapna*), Śakāra (*Cār*), Sudhākāra (*Prat*) etc. are presented. The scenes between Bhīma and Ghaṭotkaca in the *Mv* and between Bhīma and Bṛhannalā and Abhimanyu (in the *Pañc*) are also full of subtle humour. Hāsa as used by Jayadeva does not mean 'alliteration', as taken by Dr. Lévi. Curiously enough, Dr. Raja fails to see any trace of humour in these plays![2]

In the introductory verses in praise of gods and poets in the *Avantisundarīkathā* which has been ascribed to

DANDIN (?)

there is the following verse (p. 2, verse 11) in glorification of Bhāsa[3]:—

सुविभक्तमुखाद्यङ्कन्यक्कलक्षणवृत्तिभिः।
परेतोऽपि स्थितो भासः शरीरैरिव नाटकैः॥

Bhāsa is herein said to be living through his dramas which are, as it were, his body. One Bhāsa, like the God Vāsudeva described in his *Dv*, has assumed so many forms! We are told in this verse about two characteristics of Bhāsa's dramas, viz., that the five technical divisions known as *sandhis*, such as *mukha* etc., are clearly visible in these dramas, and that they possess distinct differentiating characteristics such as different *vṛttis* (styles of compositions), as suit the prevailing sentiments. These cannot be said to be the characteristics exclusively applicable to Bhāsa, as the poet has to bring out his point through comparison; and our plays will

1 Banerji Sastri, *JRAS*, 1921, p. 381. 2 *ZII*, 2, p. 262. 3 *Avantisundarikathā*, Dakshinabharati Series, No. 3, Madras, 1924.

deserve consideration to be ranked among Bhāsa's works if they do not militate against these descriptions. That these plays answer the first characteristic will be seen from MM. T. Ganapati Sastri's commentaries on them, as also from the introductions by Prof. Dhruva and Venkatarama Sastri to the different plays in the group edited by them.[1] With regard to the second concerning the styles (*vṛttis*), a close study of these dramas shows that the poet has recourse to different styles as befit the occasion. Such differences, even in the same drama, do not speak diversity of authorship. It will thus be seen that Daṇḍin's characteristics apply to these plays and hence they may be taken to have come from Bhāsa.

We find, therefore, that the characteristics of Bhāsa mentioned by Bāṇa, Vākpati, Jayadeva and Daṇḍin are all found in our plays. "It would certainly be a *nonsequitur*," as Dr. Keith says, "to conclude that the Trivandrum plays are Bhāsa's, simply because they are begun by the Sūtradhāra."[2] But, as would be readily seen above, our conclusion is not based on that interpretation of Bāṇa's testimony alone; it has been confirmed by other unimpeachable grounds.

SOME BHĀSA VERSES AND THEIR BEARING ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE TRIVANDRUM PLAYS.

It is well known that there are thirteen verses in all that are ascribed to Bhāsa by anthologists and none of them is found in the Trivandrum plays. Some of them clearly may not belong to him as they are attributed to others. One of them is found in the *Mattavilāsa*. The topic of the anthology verses will be dealt with in detail later on. Here we shall consider only one verse from the anthologists, which the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* has ascribed to Bhāsa: and this ascription is not doubted by Dr. Weller, Dr. Sarup and Dr. Thomas.[3]

The verse runs thus:

तीक्ष्णं रविस्तपति नीच इवाचिराद्यः
यद्वै रसस्यजति मित्रमिवाकृतज्ञः।

---

1 Cf. *e. g.* Ganapati Sastri, *Svapna*, pp. 147-148; *Pañc*, pp. 115-116; *Pratijñā*, pp. 127-128; Dhruva, *Madhyama* (2nd Edn.), Intr., pp. 30-32; *Pradhānani Pratijñā* (2nd Edn.), Intr., pp. 36-38; Venkatarama Sarma, *Abhiṣeka*, Intr., pp. XIV-XV; Hariyappa, *QJMS*, 23, pp. 242-243. 2 *IA*, 52, p. 60. 3 Weller, *Festgabe Jacobi*, pp. 117, 130-132; Sarup, *Vision*, Intr., p. 3; Thomas, *JRAS*, 1928, pp. 884-885.

तोयं प्रसीदति मुनेरिव चिन्तमन्तः
कामी दरिद्र इव गोष्ठमुपैति षण्ढः ॥

This clearly shows points of connection with *Avi*, IV. 9:

असित जलदवृन्दैर्मिश्रसन्दिग्धशङ्को
गगनचरकुलानां विश्रमस्थानभूतः।
सुकविमतिविचित्रो मित्रसंयोगहृद्यो
नरपतिरिव नीचो दृश्यते निष्फलाढ्यः।

The two verses, besides the simile of the "Nouveau riche," contain a number of common words (underlined above for easy reference) indicating a common authorship. Similar features to the above anthology verse are found in *Cār*, I. 26; *Pañc*, I. 6, 7, 18; *Pratijñā*, I. 4; *Avi*, V. 1 and *Cār*, I. 28. 'Āḍhya' 'rich' seems to be a favourite word with the writer of these plays.

"The resemblance shown is, be it noted," as aptly observed by Dr. Thomas, "not between the latter [*i. e.* the author of the Trivandrum plays] and the author of some *Svapnavāsavadatta*, but between him and Bhāsa nominatim".[1]

Prof. Kuppuswami Sastri in his introduction to the Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi (p. 25) quotes from *Abhinavabhārati*, a commentary on *Bharata Nāṭyaśāstra* by Abhinavagupta, the following passage which contains one verse from Bhāsa: ॥ अधुना रौद्रं लक्षयति। अथ रौद्रो नामेति। नामग्रहणस्वाद्यमाणयः। अन्धाधकारिता प्राधान्येन क्रोधस्य विषयः। तादृशि च जने सर्वोऽपि मनोरथैरपि रुधिरपानमपि कुर्यात्। तथा चाह लोकः। यदि लभ्येत तत्तदीयं रुधिरमपि पीत्वा न तृप्यते। महाकविना भासेनापि स्वप्रबन्ध उक्तम्।

त्रेतायुगं * * * तद्धि न मैथिली सा
रामस्य रागपदवी मृदु चास्य चेतः।
लब्धा जनस्तु यदि रावणमस्य कार्यं
प्रोत्कृत्य तत्र तिलशो न वितृप्तिगामी ॥

Abhinavagupta cites this as an instance of *raudra*.[2]

In deference to Prof. Dhruva's wish we herewith append our rendering of the verse. For the missing syllables in the first line we read 'न खलु' and propose 'नास्य' for 'चास्य' in the second line, and 'सुवितृप्तिगामी' for 'न वितृप्तिगामी'. We translate: that (divine) *Tretāyuga*

1 *JRAS*, 1928, pp. 884-885. 2 This occurs, with slight variations, at p. 320, of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Vol. I., GOS. No. 36.

may be said to have come to an end (since Rāvaṇa is intent on outrage); that Maithilī does not at present seem to be the object of Rāma's love *par excellence* (as she is in great danger). The heart of this man (अस्य, *i. e.*, of Rāvaṇa) is not kind (as owing to lust he has become cruel). If this man (जनः, *i. e.*, the speaker of this verse whom we take to be Hanumān) were to catch hold of Rāvaṇa he (*i. e.*, the speaker, Hanumān) will not be satisfied unless the latter's (अस्य, *i. e.*, Rāvaṇa's) body was cut to thousands of pieces. 'अस्य' in the second and third line has been taken to refer to Rāvaṇa, and 'जनः' (in the sense of अयं जनः) to the speaker of the verse. We are doubtful about the word कच्चा.

This verse is not found in the Trivandrum plays. Its context renders it probable that the verse must refer to some Rāma play, and Prof. Dhruva connects the verse with the *Prat* after Bharata's speech: भरतः—कथम्। हतेति। (मोहमुपगच्छति).[1]

We do not think the verse fits in with the sentiments of Bharata expressed in that speech or later on. Sumantra reports the news of the abduction of Sītā to Bharata and after uttering "what? (do you say Sītā has been) abducted?," the latter falls down unconscious. He has to be consoled, cheered up and is in an unhappy mood; afterwards he expresses his wrath sarcastically but he is angry with his mother, not with Rāvaṇa. It will be seen, therefore, that there is no occasion in Bharata's mood for uttering the verse quoted by Abhinavagupta which Prof. Dhruva assigns to Bharata. We find a suitable context for the verse in the *Abh* in the second act after verse 15. Hanumān is gradually becoming enraged towards Rāvaṇa, so much, that after verse 15, he says that he cannot restrain his anger (न शक्नोमि रोषं धारयितुम्) and he must have uttered the verse त्रेतायुगं etc. after भवतु। अहमेवार्यरामस्य कार्यं साधयामि in the same context. It will be seen that both Maithilī and Rāvaṇa are there; the latter is giving cause for Hanumān to express the sentiments contained in the verse (त्रेतायुगं etc.) by his behaviour with Sītā; and further, Hanumān in the height of his anger thinks of himself as performing the work of Ārya Rāma (अहमेवार्यरामस्य कार्यं साधयामि), which

1 *Pratimā*, p. 115; Dhruva's edition, p. 72 (Text). Dhruva, *Pratimā*, Intr., p. 29; *Pratimānā lupta aṅga*, *Dv. Abh. Grantha*, p. 364.

is, as the verse in question says, destroying Rāvaṇa to pieces (तिलशः प्रोत्कृत्य). Second thoughts, however, convince Hanumān of the futility of such a course being followed by him, as he says immediately afterwards: अथवा।

यद्यहं रावणं हन्मि कार्यसिद्धिर्भविष्यति।
यदि मां ग्रहरेद्रक्षो महत्कार्यं विपद्यते॥

(*Abh*, II. 16)

and so he reserves the task of killing Rāvaṇa for Śrī Rāma. There appears to be a break between भवतु। अहमेवार्यरामस्य कार्यं साधयामि and अथवा; and the verse त्रेतायुगं etc. must naturally come between the two to give expression to Hanumān's uncontrollable anger.

If the above context suggested by us be correct, Prof. Dhruva's objection as to Bhāsa's authorship of the *Abh* becomes invalid.[1] The fact that as many as two verses from the *Abh* have been omitted in the क MS and one in the ख MS as used by Venkatarama Sarma, lends an added plausibility to the view that the verse त्रेतायुगं etc. might have slipped from the *Abh*.[2]

Thus, the two above-mentioned verses go to prove genuine Bhāsa echoes in the Trivandrum plays; and we have already proved Bhāsa's authorship of them on the testimony of the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* and Rājaśekara, confirmed by Bāṇa, Vākpati, Jayadeva and Daṇḍin. As aptly observed by Dr. Keith, "to ignore these coincidences and to leave us with an anonymous dramatist of the highest Indian rank is to demand too much from probability".[3]

SOME CONTRARY VIEWS ON THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE TRIVANDRUM PLAYS.

Apropos of the question of the authorship of these plays some contrary views need refutation and in the following pages an attempt will be made to answer the views held by the antagonists. The problem divides itself into four heads, viz. (*i*) whether Śaktibhadra is the author of these plays; (*ii*) whether Śūdraka is the author; (*iii*) whether these dramas show any Kerala influence; and (*iv*) whether they are stage adaptations or compilations.

---

1 Dhruva, *Pratimā*, Intr., pp. 17-20. 2 *Abh*. II. 7, III. 9 and VI. 20 from Ganapati Sastri's edn. are not found in the MSS used for the Lahore edn. Cf-p. 23 n. 4; p. 38 n. 4; and p. 75 n. 3 of the latter. 3 *IA*, 52, p. 60.

i. BHĀSA VERSUS ŚAKTIBHADRA.

On the basis of the structural and verbal similarities that exist between Śaktibhadra's *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi* and some of the Trivandrum plays, Śaktibhadra is asserted to be the author of the plays or at least some of them. Much capital is made of the fact of the three Rāma dramas viz. the *Prat*, *Abh* and *Āścarya* being found "comprised together in an old injured *śrital* MS of Malabar".[1] But "a MS copy just like any printed book of selections in modern times, may and can comprise within itself the writing of different authors without any harm".[2] So this proves nothing.

Prof. A. Krishna Pisharoti, who suggests the authorship of Śaktibhadra, controverts it further on, on account of the author's name being found in the *Āścarya*, stating "we do not see why from these dramas alone (*i. e.* Tr. Bhāsa plays) he should have withheld his name."[3] Prof. Sastri also modifies his statement by saying that it is "without sufficient warrant".[4]

Mr. Menon, and probably Dr. Hiranand Sastri also, base their conjecture on the authority of Prof. Pisharoti and Prof. Sastri; and the latter, as shown above, are not very sure of their position.[5] We shall first consider whether on internal evidence, the three Rāma dramas could be assigned to a single author. The *Prat* and *Āścarya* stand quite distinct on account of the different plans of action conceived by their respective authors to carry out the same events *e. g.* abduction of Sītā, in the two dramas. Differences of temperament are visible in the use of the statue-house in the *Prat* and of Cūḍāmaṇi and Aṅgulīyaka in the *Āścarya*, for helping the course of action. Rāma is shown more dignified and having a keener sense of moral duty in the *Prat*. The *Abh* cannot be from the pen of the author of the *Āścarya* as there are many overlappings and repetitions (*e. g.* scenes of Aśokavanikā, fire-ordeal, etc.) which common sense would forbid a common author from introducing in a subsequent work of his.[6]

In noting the similarities of the *Āścarya* with the

1 Kuppuswami Sastri, *Āścarya*, Intr., p. 19. 2 Paranjape, *ABI*. 9, p. 5. 3 *Criticism*, pp. 21, 36, at p. 36. 4 *Āścarya*, Intr., p. 19. 5 Menon, *IHQ*. 3, pp. 220-223; *ABI*. 7, pp. 431-434. Hirananda Sastri, *MASI*. 28, p. 10. 6 Paranjape, *ABI*. 9, pp. 6-8; cf. also, Winternitz, *Kuppu. Com. Vol.*, pp. 6-8.

Trivandrum group, the above-mentioned scholars seem to have ignored points of difference between the two, which tell quite another story. The *Nāndī* verse and prologue in the *Āścarya* are of the nature of classical dramas and not 'short and succinct' like the Bhāsa plays, and they mention the name and works of the author. The Bharatavākya in the *Āścarya* is of quite different type from the normal इमां सागरपर्यन्तां etc. of the Trivandrum plays. Further, as stated by Prof. Paranjape, "ideas and expressions, words and phrases, characterization and plot-construction have very little in common with the salient features of the Bhāsa plays".[1]

Śaktibhadra mentions the *Unmādavāsavadatta* as one of his works in the prologue to the *Āścarya* and the anti-Bhāsaites are at pains to identify it with some one or the other of the Trivandrum plays. Prof. Kuppuswami declares the *Unmāda* to be "closely similar in spirit and plot to the *Pratijñā*", or that it was another title for the *Pratijñā*, having reference to Yaugandharāyaṇa's ruse of feigned madness; the learned Professor makes a further guess of the *Unmāda* being identical with a MS in Govt. Oriental MSS Library, R. No. 2784, docketted as *Viṇāvāsavadatta*, but concludes that "in the present state of our knowledge it is not possible to lift up any of these statements above the sphere of a reasonable guess".[2] The same *Viṇāvāsavadatta* has been assigned to Śūdraka by A. R. Sarasvati.[3] Dr. Hirananda Sastri, on account of the words *Unmāda* and *Svapna* being synonymous, and relying on the fact of the three Rāma dramas being found in one MS, is "tempted to think of the probable identity of the Trivandrum play with the work of Śaktibhadra".[4]

The first three acts of the *Viṇāvāsavadatta* have appeared in book form, and the later acts are in course of publication in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.[5] Dr. C. K. Raja, in a paper read before the Patna Oriental Conference, of which only a summary has appeared in the proceedings and transactions, states that the play consists of eight acts.[6] Possibly this is the same work referred to in the *Mālati-Mādhava*, Act II, 'वासवदत्ता च सञ्जयाय राज्ञे'

---

1 *ABI*, 9, p. 9. 2 Kuppuswami Sastri, *Āścarya*, Intr., pp. 9, 20 at p. 20. 3 *QJMS*, 12, pp. 276, 278. 4 *MASI*, 28, p. 10. 5 Madras Oriental Series, No. 2; JOR, Dec, 1936, pp. 1-18. 6 *OC*, VI, p. 593.

as would appear from 'सञ्जयाय दास्यामीति मुक्तं प्रतिगृह्य' (p. 8, *Viṇāvāsavadatta*, M. O. S.). We have carefully gone through the portion of the drama published so far, and find that it has much in common with the *Pratijñā* of Bhāsa. There are, however, important divergences in the plot from the Udayana plays of Bhāsa and the known Udayana legends. Thus, this play speaks of the engagement of Vāsavadattā with Sañjaya, dream of Mahāsena, his plan to capture Udayana specially with the intention of making the latter his son-in-law, Yaugandharāyaṇa also having an unlucky dream and spreading the news of the death of Udayana in the fight, Yaugandharāyaṇa's staging a fake funeral of himself in the presence of the public who were under the illusion of his magic (*vidyā*), war between Pradyota and Vatsarāja's supporters, etc. There are to be seen many Bhāsa echoes in the work, showing that the author was quite familiar with Bhāsa's works. He also seems to be well-versed in classical dramas. *Viṇāvāsavadatta* is only the name by which the work was known to the owner of the MS. "There is nothing in the body of the MS", as has been observed by Prof. K. Sastri, "to warrant this title".[1] Much importance, therefore, need not be attached to it. We are inclined to think that this *Viṇāvāsavadatta* is the same as the *Unmādavāsavadatta* written by Śaktibhadra, and that, therefore, there is no necessity to look up to any one of the Trivandrum plays for identification with the *Unmāda* and subsequently, ascription of the whole lot to Śaktibhadra.

Prof. Dhruva brings forth the testimony of Śaktibhadra himself, which is against the conjecture of assigning the Bhāsa plays to him.[2] The prologue to the Āścarya states in unmistakable terms that there was no Sanskrit drama in Kerala before Śaktibhadra's time, *i. e.*, tenth century. But we have references to Bhāsa long before that time, at any rate, since the seventh century (Bāṇa). Hence, Śaktibhadra cannot be the author of the plays that were known centuries before his time.

---

1 *Viṇāvāsavadatta*, Mad. Or. Series, p. 1. 2 *Pratimā*, Intr., pp. 21-22 ef.

सूत्रधारः—आर्ये दक्षिणपथादागतमात्मवैचूडामणि नाम नाटकमभिनयाजेभिर्सौभाग्यमभिलषाम इत्यार्यमिश्राणां शासनम्।

नटी—अज्ज, अधादिदं सु पढं। आआसे पसवइ पुप्फं सिन्दाओ अ तेहं उप्पज्जन्ति जइ दक्खिणाओ दिसाओ णाडअमिणन्वणं।

13423

Cumulative effect of what we have stated above is conclusively against the authorship of Śaktibhadra. He was simply an imitator of Bhāsa. Ascription of the Trivandrum plays to Śaktibhadra, in Dr. Keith's opinion, "evinces the same curious lack of discrimination which ascribes to Daṇḍin the *Avantisundarīkathā*, credits Bāṇa with the *Pārvatīpariṇaya* and would rob Kālidāsa of the *Ṛtusaṁhāra*."[1]

ii. ŚŪDRAKA?

Of late, it has been seriously propounded by some that Śūdraka may be the author of some of these Trivandrum plays.[2] Mr. A. R. Sarasvati identifies Śūdraka with Vikramāditya and credits him with the authorship of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* and *Viṇāvāsavadatta*,[3] the latter of which, as indicated above, may have come from Śaktibhadra. In the introduction to the '*Caturbhāṇī*' the editors follow the same view and ascribe the *Mṛcch*, *Bāl*, *Avi* and *Vatsarājacarita* to Śūdraka.[4] Mr. Sankar tries to prove the identity of Bhāsa and Śūdraka placing Bhāsa (that is, Śūdraka, according to him) between 475-500 A. D. and ascribes to him the authorship of the *Svapna*, *Pratijñā*, *Abh*, *Pañc*, *Dv*, *Bāl*, *Avi*, *Padmaprābhṛtaka* and *Mṛcch*.[5]

All these scholars pronounce the *Cār* to be an abridgment for stage purposes of the *Mṛcch* or a different recension of the latter, and on general grounds of similarity ascribe some of the Trivandrum plays to Śūdraka. Relationship between the *Cār* and *Mṛcch* will be considered in a later chapter and there it will be shown especially on account of the essential differences between the two, that the *Mṛcch* is the revised and enlarged version of the *Cār*. Both these works can never be contemporaneous, nor can they be the work of the same author. It will thus be seen that in the view of the matter that we take, the question of Śūdraka does not arise, he being later in time to the composition of the Trivandrum plays, and the latter works being from the pen of one author, there can be found no works from

1 *HSL*, p. XIII. 2 A. R. Sarasvati, *QJMS*, 12, pp. 268-282; Ramakrishna Kavi, *Avantisundarikathā*, Intr.; Sankar, *AMV*, 2, pp. 41-64. 3 *QJMS*, 12, p. 276. 4 Intr., pp. II-III. 5 *Vatsarājacaritam* is an alternative title for the *Pratijñā* ('वा' *MS* used by T. G. Sastri, p. 73 printed *Pratijñā*) No. 12542 in the Cat. Govt. *MSS* Library, Madras; Sankar, *AMV*, 2, p. 60.

8492

amongst them to be fathered upon Śūdraka or anybody else.

iii. KERALA INFLUENCE.

It has been contended that these plays show a Kerala influence as is evident from "Some Prakrit passages."[1] Three words from the *Cār* have been picked up by Dr. Raja as showing a Kerala origin, of which '*aṇṭhi*' has been shown by Dr. Thomas to be of Sanskrit paternity, and the other two also, are shown not to be due to any Kerala influence by Harihar Sastri.[2]

Prof. Kuppuswami Sastri finds in the use of the word '*Sambandha*,' a reference to the Sambandha marriages prevalent in Malabar. The learned scholar further finds in Mahāsena's queen an elderly Malayalam lady and a Malayali in Yaugandharāyaṇa.[3] We fail to see any special Malayali characteristic in them. As to Sambandha marriages, "Sambandha is neither more nor less than civil marriage with right of divorce. The presentation of a cloth by the *vara* to the *vadhū* with a social dinner constitutes the entire ritual. No Sanskrit mantras are recited... The wife does not share the religious life of her husband and the husband does not interdine with his wife ...."[4] Applying these tests to the marriages of Vāsavadattā and Kuraṅgī, which are alleged to be Sambandha marriages, we find that neither of these can be styled as such on any account. Mr. R. Kavi, another anti-Bhāsaite, asserts on the contrary that these dramas show no Malayalam influence.[5] Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti has tried to show, time and again, basing his conclusion on small details that can very well be found anywhere in India and not confined to Kerala alone, that these dramas proceed from Kerala;[6] such, *e. g.*, are: (*i*) The queen's sympathy towards a low-born person has been taken to imply that she was a śūdra woman in accordance with the practice of the Kerala kings. Obviously a far-fetched interpretation! The fact that the queen's brother was a king of Sauvīras speaks against any such assumption. (*ii*) The form of address 'Mātula' ('Uncle') to old persons

---

1 *JOR*, 1, pp. 217-225. 2 Thomas, *JRAS*, 1928, p. 890; Harihar Sastri, *JOR*, 2, pp. 210-213. 3 *Ācarya*, Intr., pp. 26-27. 4 K. G. Sankar, letter dated 14-8-32. 5 *JAHRS*, 2, p. 143. 6 Avi, *Shama'a*, Madras, 4, pp. 287, 289, 290 etc.; 5, pp. 279, 283 etc.; *Abh. JAU*, 4, p. 141; 5, pp. 125, 248; *Bāl*, *QJMS*, 1925-26, reprint, pp. 1, 12, 17, 21, 39 etc.; *Pratimā*, *QJMS*, 12, pp. 304-306; 14, pp. 47-48. Cf. for the latter statement, *Shama'a*, 5, p. 122 n. 1.

is not restricted to Kerala alone. (*iii*) At one place, Prof. Pisharoti is constrained to admit that the author was a non-Malayali, showing thereby the necessity of extreme caution required in jumping to conclusions from isolated instances.

Messrs. Pisharotis on account of (1) the absence of Sītā in the coronation, (2) reference to statue-houses, and (3) manner of worshipping the statues, find a local colouring therein.[1]

As to the queen not partaking in the coronation, Dr. G. Sastri has shown that it was only in the first coronation of Rāma in the *Prat* that Sītā did not take part as it was a coronation as Yuvarāja and hence of secondary importance. Besides, Vasiṣṭha, Vāmadeva and others knew before-hand that the coronation was not to take place.[2] And further, by separating Sītā the poet described the *valkala*-incident foreshadowing forest life. On the occasion of the main coronation of Rāma as king, however, Sītā is mentioned as having been with him. Similarly in the *Abh* at the main coronation, Sītā is described as being with Rāma.[3] Prof. Paranjape, on the other hand, says that Sītā did not take part in either and justifies Sītā's absence in the first coronation on the authority of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[4] As to the second coronation, he says that the *Rāmāyaṇa* mentions Sītā's accompanying Rāma on the occasion and also of Śatrughna and Bharata and the mothers; but Bhāsa did not follow the *Rāmāyaṇa* in making Rāma alone leave the stage lest the stage would have been left empty. It was thus for the convenience of the stage and not for the custom of Kerala that Rāma leaves the stage alone.

Turning to the second argument of the Pisharotis, *viz.* that the idea of the Pratimā-gṛha is suggested from the statue of a Chera king in a Śiva temple at Tiruvanchikulam, Dr. Sastri distinguishes the Pratimā-gṛhas in the drama from the statue in the Śiva temple. The drama mentions the statue-house as intended for the installations and worship of the departed kings and not a Śiva or Viṣṇu temple with the statue of

1 *Criticism*, pp. 30-31. 2 *Critical Study*, p. 100; *BSOS*, 3, pp. 630-631.
3 *Prat*, p. 131. ततः प्रविशति कृताभिषेको रामः सपरिवारः।
Abh, p. 81. ततः प्रविशति कृताभिषेको रामः सीतया सह।
Pratimā, Intr., pp. XIII-XIX.

a departed king. "The sort of Pratimā-gṛha described in the *Pratimā*," says MM. Dr. G. Sastri, is to be found nowhere".[1] But the fact that such statues are not confined to Kerala only stands proved by the discovery of Śaiśunāga statues some fifteen years ago. MM. Dr. Haraprasad Sastri has drawn attention to the prevalence of the custom of erecting stone images for the departed kings in Rajputana called Chatris, from ancient times. These statues are worshipped daily and food is offered to them. Curiously enough, kings dead in war are presented in statues on horseback, those dying natural death in other postures.[2] It will be seen, therefore, that this contention also of the Pisharotis falls to the ground.

White-washing of the statue-house, flowers and other preliminaries of worshipping described in the *Prat* are taken as showing Kerala influence. That such is the custom all over India may be seen even today. Further, Bhāsa might have taken his description from the *Rāmāyaṇa* itself.

In order to strengthen the argument of Kerala origin, it is stated that the *Prat* must come after Kālidāsa, the *Cār* after Śūdraka, and the *Avi* after Daṇḍin.[3]

As to the genealogy of Raghu's dynasty, it has been proved, that both Kālidāsa and Bhāsa have taken it from a common source, which Dr. G. Sastri says to be the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, and the two commentaries on the *Raghuvaṁśa* confirm him.[4] This view finds further support from the *Harivaṁśa* (chapter 15) and the *Brahmapurāṇa*, which give a similar order. Dr. Haradatta Sarma in "*Padmapurāṇa* and Kālidāsa" has shown that the *Padmapurāṇa* is the source of Kālidāsa for the *Raghuvaṁśa*. So borrowing from Kālidāsa is not true nor consequently a late date for the *Prat*, *i. e.* for Bhāsa.

That the *Cār* is the basis for the *Mṛcch* forms the subject matter of a subsequent chapter, and hence nothing need be said about it at this place.

No evidence is adduced for dating the *Avi* after Daṇḍin, except that in the *Avantisundarīkathā*, "we

1 *BSOS*, 3, p. 629; *Critical Study*, p. 99. 2 Haraprasad Sastri, *JBORS*, 5, p. 559; *PB*, 1929, p.131; *OC*, V, pp. 97-98; Paranjape, *Pratimā*, Intr, pp. XL-XLI. 3 Pisharoti, *BSOS*, 3, p. 107. 4 *BSOS*, 3, p. 627; *Critical Study*, p. 96.

may find many verses common to it and *Avi*,"[1] which proves nothing. Further it has not been shown that the story of the *Avi* was not existing before Daṇḍin.

Thus these arguments also fail to bring conviction home, and hence the efforts to show Kerala influence in these dramas and thereby to indicate them as the compositions of a Kerala dramatist are fruitless.

Dr. Ganapati Sastri experienced sweetness, directness and vigour in these dramas and he proclaimed these as the characteristic merits of our plays; but, as stated by Dr. Thomas, "that is not the character of the Kerala Sanskrit in general,—witness the *Nalodaya* and similar works".[2]

Further, these dramas are quite well known in Kerala since the last ten centuries. Had they been the work of any Cākyār or a Kerala dramatist, the rhetoricians or anthologists might have embodied the names of the authors when they took verses from these plays. This clearly shows that they are not the works of any poet from the South.

We do not know anything definitely about the ability of the Cākyārs to compose dramas in Sanskrit. Prof. Otto Stein (*Indoligica Pragnesia*, 1, 1929, pp. 21 ff.) has already raised doubts as to how far the Cākyārs were literary men who were capable of recasting classical dramas by shortening them and working them up into stage plays."[3] Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti, on the other hand, declares them to be literary men and scholars, but this does not seem to be proved. Sanskritists must really be grateful to Prof. Pisharoti for the amount of varied information supplied by him with regard to the Kerala theatre.[4] Illustrations also accompany his learned articles published in the *AUJ* and therein he tells us about the various types of the spectacular entertainments in Kerala under three heads, the religious, secular and semi-religious. For the Bhāsa controversy, we are concerned with the last head which deals with Sanskrit dramas—especially the variety known as "Kuṭiyāttam." The number of acts in which the Cākyārs can train

1 Pisharotis, *BSOS*, 3, p. 107. 2 *JRAS*,1928, p. 881. 3 Winternitz, *BRRI*, 5, p. 11. 4 Pisharoti, *IHQ*, 1, pp. 338-340; *JBRAS*, 1925, pp. 246-251; *QJMS*, 12, pp. 183-195; *JAU*, 1, pp. 91-113; 3, pp. 141-159; *ADC*, pp. 48-56; *BSOS*, 3, pp. 111-114 (in collaboration with A. K. Pisharoti).

themselves is seventy-two including some *prahasanas* and one-act plays. Many of these acts have been identified. The stereotyped *sthāpanā* is said to be due to Kerala reform. Now, the stage reform in Kerala is not placed earlier than the eighth century, while the *Svapnavāsavadatta* (and the other plays of the group) existed in the form in which we have it at present, much before that time. It is, therefore, most reasonable to suppose that Bhāsa's dramas were most popular in the South from early times on account of their being admirably suited for the stage. And the Kerala dramatists and actors were so much impressed by the different devices in these dramas employed for stage economy and the stage-worthiness of these plays, that they at once copied those peculiarities and embodied them in their manuals. In course of time when these dramas lost the *prarocanā* from their *sthāpanā*, people forgot about Bhāsa's authorship of them, and came to regard the innovations as those inaugurated by the Kerala dramatists.

To sum up the whole discussion about the Kerala origin of the Trivandrum Bhāsa plays, we may say with Prof. Paranjape, who would rather appear to be harsh on the so-called Kerala-pandits: "The desecrating vandalism of the literary thieves of Kerala may certainly be able to mangle and mutilate old plays; but they can never build up a new superstructure of the delicacy of a *Svapnavāsavadatta* or the grandeur of a *Pratimā*"

iv. ADAPTATIONS OR COMPILATIONS?

Finally it has been suggested as a last recourse that if these works cannot be the compositions of the Kerala poets, those poets must, at least, have brought out their compilation or adaptation. Dr. Barnett, however, holds that these plays were worked over by the court poets of the Pāṇḍya kings, while A. R. Sarasvati and others take them to be from the Pallava kings.[2] In support of this Messrs. Pisharotis, Dr. Raja and Prof. K. Sastri bring forth no stronger argument than the existence of a living tradition among Malayalam pandits;[3] MM. Dr. T. G. Sastri, G. Harihar Sastri, S. Narayenan Potti

1 *Pratimā*, Intr., p. XXXI. 2 Barnett, *JRAS*, 1919, p. 233; Sarasvati, *IHQ*, 1, pp. 263-264; also Kavi, *JABRS*, 2, p. 143. 3 Pisharotis, *BSOS*, 3, p. 116; Raja, *XII*, 2, p. 264; Kuppuswami Sastri, *Āścarya*, Intr., p. 19.

and others dispute the correctness of this tradition.[1] Dr. Sukthankar finds "a substantial basis for this assumption"[2] in Dr. Lévi's discovery of two treatises on rhetorics.[3] Dr. Raja states that in Malabar there is a dramatized version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in twenty-one acts, presumably compilations by Cākyārs![4] But this dramatized *Rāmāyaṇa* Saga is nothing else than the *Prat*, *Abh* and *Āścarya*. Does the learned Doctor assign the *Āścarya* also to Cākyār authorship?

Dr. Thomas has proved that the plot and text of the original *Svapna* have not undergone any great transformation, and they have been attested "at such a date and in such a manner as to require us to dispense... with...all considerations of Kerala dramatic practice".[5] And the *Svapna* was, and is, the most popular piece on stage! The existence of other dramas of the group prior to the seventh century A. D. has been testified by Bāṇa. The stage reforms in Kerala began long after that and the *Āścarya* hails as the first drama from the South. Hence the theory of adaptation or compilation by actors or Pandits is untenable.

"A compilation", writes Dr. Winternitz, "is a literary work composed of materials, culled from different works and authors, like the *Purāṇas* or the *Hanūman Nāṭaka*....every one of the thirteen Bhāsa plays...has the mark of originality. It is simply absurd to call plays like *Svapna* or *Avi* compilations. *Macbeth* and *Julius Cæsar* remain works of Shakespeare even when they are adapted for the stage....we always find some original idea [in these plays] which presupposes an original poet and not a compiler".[6] Though there is a good deal of change in Dr. Winternitz's views regarding the authorship of these plays, he holds the same views about their not being compilations or adaptations. Says he: "Plays like *Ūrubhaṅga*, *Pañcarātra* and *Bālacarita*, to say nothing of such works as the *Svapnavāsavadatta* and *Pratijñā-Yaugandharāyaṇa*, or *Avimāraka* are original works, and cannot by any stretch of the term be designated as

1 G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, pp. 79, 105-106; Potti, Malayalam Intr. to *Avi*. 2 *JBBRAS*, 1925, p. 134. It may, however, be noted that they prove only different recensions of the play. See Dr. Sukthankar himself, op. cit., p. 138; Dr. Sarup, *Vision*, Intr., p. 28; Dr. Thomas, *JRAS*, 1928, pp. 877-899. 3 *ZII*. 2, p. 254. 4 *JRAS*, 1928, pp. 877-880. 5 *Bhagavadajjukiya*, 1925, preface, p. VII.

'Compilations'."[1] Thus, these Trivandrum Bhāsa plays cannot be called adaptations, since, though dramatic works such as those of Kālidāsa or Shakespeare "are specially liable to recast", "they do not thereby forfeit their connection with their original authors."[2]

Further, the Cākyārs stage only select acts after giving different names to them, *e. g. Mantrāṅka*, *Pephālikāṅka*, *Mallāṅka*, etc. with necessary changes.[3] Hence the particular act would be adapted for the stage and not the whole dramatic work; so whole dramas cannot be set aside as adaptations. We find that all the acts from our plays present the same features of style and thought, which is quite impossible if a particular act is from the stage edition and the remaining part from the original. It is but a natural conclusion, therefore, that our plays are not stage copies. *Dāmaka Prahasanam* may be cited as the best instance of a compilation.

The same argument may be used with regard to the *Āścarya*. Select scenes from this play also are enacted; so why is it ascribed to Śaktibhadra? The *Mattavilāsa*, *Śākuntala* and *Nāgānanda* also are not called adaptations though they form part of the repertory of Kerala actors. The *Āścarya* and *Mṛcch* have different names for different acts given by the Cākyārs, still they pass under the names of their respective authors. It seems that our plays are called adaptations simply because in addition to their being included in the Cākyār repertoire, they are anonymous; and being so are thought capable of being assigned to any one as a common property. It is really the most unhappy thing that such should be the case with the works of the pioneer Indian dramatist.

Though it was argued that a large number of plays form part of the "Kerala Nāṭaka Cakra", the term at present is confined only to Bhāsa's works in the Trivandrum series. Why is it that in spite of diligent research no further MSS of the so-called Kerala Nāṭaka Cakra are discovered? It may perhaps be that there are no separate plays that can be designated as Kerala Nāṭaka

---

1 *BRRI*, 5, p. 11. 2 Thomas, *JRAS*, 1928, p. 877. See also Winternitz, *Bhagavadajjukiya*, preface, p. VII, and Thomas, *JRAS*, 1925, pp. 106-107. 3 G. Sastri, *BSOS*, 3, p. 634; also K. Rama Pisharoti, *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 250; Pisharotie, *BSOS*, 3, pp. 113-114.

Cakra; that the Kerala actors, who are called dramatists by courtesy, were not original writers in Sanskrit; and that Sanskrit texts alone constituted what has been called Kerala Nāṭaka Cakra.

In spite of various articles elucidating the part the Cākyārs played in the development of the Kerala stage, we as yet get no idea as to what they did with regard to the texts of Sanskrit works. As justly observed by Dr. Johnston, "it would also be desirable to know what liberties this school of actors took with the text of other plays already known to us in standard recensions; for this would give us some measure of the extent to which the originals may have been manipulated for these acting versions."[1] From the fact that no light has yet been thrown on this point by any anti-Bhāsaite Kerala scholar, which would at once have settled the controversy to a great extent, we are afraid, there do not seem to be any serious differences between the authors' and the actors' versions of the same play.

Why the anti-Bhāsaites should not see the other way round is a thing that passes understanding. Why not take it that all the so-called peculiarities of the Kerala stage are imitations of and improvements on Bhāsa after practical experience? If these Trivandrum plays are really the stage versions of different Sanskrit plays, where are the originals of which these plays are mere adaptations? Why is it that of the different dramatic pieces enacted by the professional players those of Bhāsa only should be lost? Supposing these Trivandrum plays had in their prologues an explicit mention of Bhāsa as their author, or by some good chance we come across MSS from the North of Bhāsa plays identical with those published in the T. S. S., what about the traces of a later period, Kerala influence, etc. found in our plays by the antagonists? The kind of evidence demanded by some of the non-believers for establishing the authenticity of the Trivandrum plays is of such a nature that it can never comeforth.

Thus, all the above arguments would strongly and conclusively establish, it is hoped, that these plays are original compositions and cannot be called compilations

1 *Id*, *Gl*, p. 95.

or adaptations by any amount of provincialism or flight of imagination. Minor changes are inevitable and might have been introduced by the Cākyārs for conveniences of the stage. But that does not rob Bhāsa of the authorship of these plays. It is a relief to read from an antagonist "Bhāsa's plays have come down to us almost intact with some omissions".[1]

---

1 Sankar, *AMV*, 2, p. 64.

CHAPTER III.

THE DATE OF BHĀSA.

Chronology in the history of Indian literature is shrouded in mystery and in spite of the efforts of many research scholars, most of the riddles still remain unsolved. The problem of the date and birth-place of Kālidāsa has engaged the attention of eminent Sanskritists for over a century and still we are without any date or place for the Shakespeare of India, that may be acceptable to all. One is rather tempted to quote the oft-repeated utterance of a celebrated American orientalist: "All dates given in Indian literary history are pins set up to be bowled down again."[1]

The date of Bhāsa is one of the most vexed questions in Indian chronology and one is surprised to find a difference of over fifteen hundred years in the earliest and latest dates ascribed to him by different scholars.[2] We have already seen that these dramas are neither compilations nor adaptations, and also that the earliest reference to them by name is from Bāṇa (7th

---

1 Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, Leipzig, 1879, Intr. 2 Cf. R. Garbe, *Festgabe Jacobi*, p. 127; Sukthankar, *JBBRAS*, 26, p. 233; Kirata, Bhāsa's works, Marathi translation, pp. 215-216. Some of the names and dates including new ones are given below:—

Bhide, Dikshitar, Ganapati Sastri Haraprasad Sastri, Khuperkar. Kirata and Tataka.	...	6th-4th century B. C.
Jahagirdar, Kulkarni, Shembavnekar, Chandhury, Dhruva and Jayaswal	...	3rd century B. C. 2nd-1st century B. C.
Konow, Lindenau, Sarup, Suali, and Weller.	...	2nd century A. D.
Banerji Sastri, Bhandarkar, Jacobi, Jolly and Keith.	...	3rd century A. D.
Lesny and Winternitz. ...	...	4th century A. D.
Sankar.	...	5th or 6th century A. D.
Barnett, Dandhar, Hiranands Sastri Nerurkar, Pisharoti and Sarasvati.		7th century A. D.
Kane and Raja. ...	...	9th century A. D.
Ramavatar Sarma. ...	...	10th century A. D.
Reddi Sastri. ...	...	11th century A. D.

century A. D.). Therefore all dates later than the 7th century assigned to Bhāsa are clearly out of order. In coming at our own conclusions as to the problem INTERNAL EVIDENCE which fixes the upper limit of the date, may be considered first.

1. Concerning the sources of the plays, we find that the epic and the *Rāmāyaṇa* plays are based on the two great epics, the Udayana plays are drawn from historical traditions, the *Avimāraka* from popular folklore (or preferably a *Jātaka* story) and the *Cārudatta* is possibly of the poet's own creation. Now, Udayana, Pradyota and Darśaka are historical personages and their period has been generally accepted to be not later than the 6th century B. C.[1] The epics were certainly known before this period, though in a different form to that we have at present.[2] Avimāraka may be a legendary hero who can be placed before this period, and Cārudatta also is not later.

Thus, Bhāsa dramas are not earlier than the 6th century B. C.

2. We find some 'historical data' in the *Pratijñā*, *Avi* and *Svapna*. The *Pratijñā* enumerates the royal families of Northern India whose very memory would have been lost in the post-Mauryan period after their subjugation by Mahāpadmananda of Magadha before 384 B. C., and later by Candragupta, along with many small Gaṇa States. Bhāsa's mention of them shows that he must have been not far later in time than the period of the Nandas or Candragupta. The kingdom of Kāśi mentioned in the *Pratijñā* and *Avi* had ceased to exist long before the 5th century B. C. Again, the poet is aware of Rājagṛha as the capital of Magadha, rightly placed in Darśaka's time, and it was transferred to Pāṭaliputra subsequently. The *Cārudatta*, which has no historical background if stripped from the *Mṛcch* mentions Pāṭaliputra in such a way as to raise doubts in the readers' mind as to its being a capital.[3] We would not

---

1 Smith, *EHI*, pp. 38, 39, 51; Rapson, *CHI*, pp. 311-313; Jayaswal, *JASB*, pp. 207-209; Ghosh, *OC*, VIII, Summaries, pp. 66-67; Ketkar, *Prācina Mahārāṣṭra*, pp. 140-148; Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.*, pp. 69-71. 2 Cf. Macdonell, *HSL*, pp. 285, 309; Venkataramnan, *MR*, 1914, p. 598. C. V. Vaidya places the last redaction of the *Mbh* before third Century B. C. Cf. *Upasaṁhāra*, p. 185. 3 Cf. H. Sastri, *OC*, V, p. 97; *PB*, 1929, p. 131; Bhide, *Svapna*, Intr, p. 40.

be far from right in holding the *Cār* as depicting the events of the poet's time. This would put the poet somewhere in the 5th or 4th century B. C.

3. References to Nāgavana, Veṇuvana, Rājagṛha and Pāṭaliputra, all of which rose into prominence after Buddha's time, as also to *Śākyaśramaṇaka*, *Nagnāśramaṇikā* etc. clearly show that the poet lived after Buddha's time, *i. e.* 6th century B. C., and hence Dr. G. Sastri's attempt to place him in pre-Buddhistic times is not acceptable.[1]

4. In the *Prat* (page 99) various *Śāstras* (treatises) are mentioned with the names of their respective authors:

साङ्गोपाङ्गं वेदमधीते, मानवीयं धर्मशास्त्रं, माहेश्वरं योगशास्त्रं,
बार्हस्पत्यमर्थशास्त्रं, नेशानिषेन्यायशास्त्रं, प्राचेतसं आद्धकल्पं च।

We do not agree with Mr. Sankar in holding that "the reference is not to specific treatises, but to the sciences and their mythical founders, Manu etc."[2] That all these treatises actually existed has been vouched for from earliest times.

साङ्गोपाङ्गं वेदम् The Vedas with their sub-heads are available even now and their composition is placed much before eighth century B. C.

मानवीयं धर्मशास्त्रम् Mānavīya Dharmaśāstra is the original of our *Manusmṛti*. Though the latter may have been composed according to some scholars in the second century A. D., there is no doubt as to the prevalence of the former since a very long time. Gautama, the oldest Dharmasūtrakāra according to Dr. Bühler, refers to Manu, doubtless to Mānavīya Dharmaśāstra. Similarity between a Buddhist canonical work and the extant *Manusmṛti* led MaxMüller to think of the priority of Manu to the former which is earlier than the third century B. C.[3] Thus *Mānavīyam Dharmaśāstram* may be placed some centuries anterior to the sixth century B. C.

माहेश्वरं योगशास्त्रम् That the *Yogaśāstra* has first been promulgated and practised by the great God Siva is quite well known. Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar has proved the existence of the Lakulīśa sect for at least two thousand years and also that Lakulīśa was the last incarnation of

1 *Critical Study*, pp. 68-69. 2 *Problem of Bhāsa*, *AMV*, 2, p. 42. 3 MaxMüller, *SBE*, X. Intr. Jolly, *Recht und Sitte*, pp. 5-6, places Gautama in the fifth or sixth century B. C., and the *Mānavīya Dharmaśāstra* is earlier, since Gautama refers to it.

Maheśvara, the propounder of Yoga.[1] This *Śāstra*, therefore, roughly belongs to the period we have assigned to the Mānavīya Dharmaśāstra.

बार्हस्पत्यमर्थशास्त्रम् The science of politics by Bṛhaspati is referred to in the *Mbh* and Kauṭilya in his *Arthaśāstra* expressly says that he has laid it under contribution.[2] It is, therefore, quite old and being earlier than the fourth century B. C., it may have been composed some centuries earlier. A small treatise published by Dr. Thomas in the Punjab Oriental Series is not the work referred to above. *Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra* is yet to be discovered.

प्राचेतसं श्राद्धकल्पम्, also, like the previous works is yet to be unearthed. In the Catalogue of the Calcutta Sanskrit College there exists a Śrāddhakalpa ascribed to Prajāpati, and Prācetas is a Prajāpati (*Manu*, I. 35). So, perhaps, the work in the Sanskrit College may have some connection with the Prācetasa Śraddhakalpa.[3] *Prācetas Smṛti* is cited in many legal works. Nothing militates against placing this work in the period we have assigned to the works we have considered above.

Lastly we come to **मेधातिथेर्न्यायशास्त्रम्** which has been the focus of a sharp controversy. The articles by Dr. Keith and Dr. Sukthankar on the point make it sufficiently clear that the work cannot refer to the *Manubhāṣya* of Medhātithi (tenth century A. D.).[4] In the first place, the context is against such an interpretation. Separate *Śāstras* are mentioned and there is no place for a commentary therein. Again, all the *Śāstras* mentioned along with this *Nyāyaśāstra* are of a hoary antiquity and the natural presumption is that the *Nyāyaśāstra* must also belong to the same period. There is no authority, further, for holding the *Manubhāṣya* as a *Nyāyaśāstra*. The parallel instance from the *Mbh* of the separation of a text from its commentary by the interposition of a different work adduced by Dr. Barnett is imperfect as shown by Dr. Keith.[5] In 1920, MM.

---

1 JBRAS, 22, pp. 151-167; also *Mbh*, *Śāntiparva*, 349, vv 64-67; Cf. *Bhagavadajjukiya*, p. 76. 2 Mbh, *Śāntiparva*, 59, vv 59, 75, 76, 81-84. *Kaut. Arth*, p. 1 **बृहस्पतिः शुक्रबृहस्पतिभ्याम्** । and also pp. 6, 29, 63, 177, 199, 375. Banerji Sastri (*JBORS*, 1923, p. 67) seems to take Bṛhaspati as the customary designation of Kauṭilya, but both cannot be identified since Kauṭilya definitely refers to Bṛhaspati as distinct from Kauṭilya (*Arthaśāstra*, above references). 3 Keith, *BSOS*, 3, p. 625 n. 4. 4 Keith, *BSOS*, 3, pp. 235, 623-625; Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, pp. 131-132; also Winternitz, *CR*, Dec. 1924, p. 348. 5 Barnett, *BSOS*, 3,

Vidyabhusana identified this Medhātithi with Gautama, since "in the *Mahābhārata* we find that Medhātithi and Gautama were the names of one and the same person, one being his proper name and the other his family name".[1] Gautama is credited with the composition of a *Nyāyaśāstra*, and 'Nyāya', *prima facie* means 'logic'. Placing the name of a tenth century commentator in the mouth of a prehistoric personage such as Rāvaṇa, is such an obviously absurd anachronism that even the plagiarist of the tenth or eleventh century would blush to plead guilty of the charge. Again, by identifying Medhātithi's *Nyāyaśāstra* with the *Manubhāṣya*, we make Rāma, the hero of the play, liable to be considered as a person below average understanding since he could not detect such a simple blunder in the speech of Rāvaṇa, as would appear from the former's acceptance of this obvious catch without any comment. Rāvaṇa is certainly not represented as a 'braggart'; for, the poet, evidently a devout Vaiṣṇava, would not picture his hero as not being able to know what an average spectator would immediately understand. The mentioning of the Bārhaspatya *Arthaśāstra* and Māheśvara *Yogaśāstra*, where the plagiarist could easily have specified Kauṭilīya *Arthaśāstra* and Pātañjala *Yogaśāstra*, are against identifying *Nyāyaśāstra* with *Manubhāṣya*. The poet evidently wants to create an atmosphere of antiquity.

All these texts are very old, 'of venerable age' and may safely be placed prior to the sixth century B. C.[2]

The *Pratijñā* mentions 'Hastiśikṣā.' No such work is found in Sanskrit literature; but it may be presumed to be very old.

LANGUAGE AND PRAKRIT EVIDENCE,

if properly studied, would land us into safe chronological limits. Meerwarth suggests this as a criterion to determine from the style of a particular period, the age of any given work. But, unfortunately as noted

pp. 520-521; Keith, *BSOS*, 3, pp. 623-625.

1 *History of Indian Logic*, p. 18. This interpretation has been accepted by Keith, Winternitz, Paranjape, Devdhar, etc. 2 Prof. Kane who stated that the *Nyāyaśāstra* of Medhātithi was the *Manubhāṣya*, in 1920 (*VJV*, 1920, p. 100) is not satisfied with the evidence brought forth and still doubts the equation, Medhātithi-Gautama (Letter dated 11-6-32). His argument that Gautama is not referred to as Medhātithi in any work on *Nyāyaśāstra* is strong enough; but the identity of the two is the only solution of the absurdity created by bringing in Medhātithi's *Manubhāṣya*.

by Prof. Pisharoti, "constituent elements of style of any age" are yet "to be analysed" and hence no theorizing can be based under this head.[1] The following observations are tentatively put in the hope of seeing whether they help in some way in arriving at some date.

Archaisms or solecisms in contravention of Pāṇini cannot assign to an author a date anterior to the grammarian as observed by Dr. G. Sastri.[2] Pāṇini should be placed according to Dr. Bhandarkar before the 7th century B. C.[3] So Bhāsa is later than the seventh century B. C. From the flowing tone of Bhāsa's Sanskrit and the conversational style of his dialogues which are short, easy, graceful and colloquial, we are inclined to think that Sanskrit was a spoken language in Bhāsa's time, and so we place Bhāsa after Pāṇini before the latter's grammar got a strong foothold, and possibly before Kātyāyana (350 B. C.).

The following words also show the same date approximately. 'Mahābrāhmaṇa' in a good sense is found in ancient literature (*Bṛhad Up.* ii. 19. 22), while in later times the word has degenerated, meaning 'a funeral priest.' 'Āryaputra' is used in these dramas in the sense of a 'prince', which is found in Aśokan inscriptions. Later dramatic works use the term as a form of address by wife to her lord. 'Yavanikā' in these plays means 'a veil' and not 'curtain', which meaning was attached to the word probably after Greek influence. These words tend to show the antiquity, if not the exact date, of the plays.[4]

Considerations of METRICS AND PRAKRIT, if properly pursued, ought to simplify the problem. The problem of Prakrit has been much obscured by the mass of literature grown around it. We have considered these problem selsewhere in this book, but they do not lead us to any definite conclusion. It may, however, be safely stated that the data furnished by these do not, at any rate, militate against the atmosphere of antiquity that the facts we are now considering imply.

Closely allied to the language question is the study of these plays from the point of DRAMATIC TECHNIQUE.

---

1 Meerwarth, *JASB*, 1917, p. 279; Pisharoti, *IHQ*, 1, p. 331. 2 *Critical Study*, pp.62-66. 3 18. *EHD*, p. 8; for Kātyāyana, Ibid, p.7. 4 Jayaswal, *JASB*, 1913, p. 262.

Positive evidence as to the antiquity of Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* is lacking and there are many interpolations and possibly revisions in the text. It is extremely doubtful, if this *Nāṭyaśāstra*, even if it existed in Bhāsa's time, was in the same form, as we have it today. Pāṇini mentions *Naṭasūtras*[1] and further, Bhāsa is credited with having written a *Nāṭyaśāstra*.[2] This also forms part of a later chapter, but as no definite chronological data are forthcoming, dramatic technique does not help us in coming to a definite date.

SOCIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS

reflected in the works also constitute a factor in fixing the date of the plays within certain limits. Only a few such cases of known date will be dealt with below.

i. A custom of throwing sand in the enclosures of temples is recorded in the *Prat* (Act III, pp. 54, 59) and according to MM. Haraprasad Sastri, this is found in Āpastamba's work only, belonging to the fifth century B. C.[3] This fact shows the author of these plays to have flourished in a period not far from Āpastamba.

ii. From the *Pratijñā* and *Svapna*, we find that Udayana did not think Avantī and Magadha in any way inferior in social status to himself, from the fact of his contracting marital relations with princesses of those countries. That Sindhusauvīra was not looked upon as of mixed origin, is evident from Nārada's coming to Kuntibhoja, a relative of Sugṛhīta, a king of Sindhusauvīra, and also consenting to the marriage of the former's daughter with Avimāraka, a Sauvīra prince. Baudhāyana has dubbed the residents of Avantī, Aṅga, Magadha, Surāṣṭra, Sindha, Sauvīra, as of mixed origin and out of Āryāvarta. Baudhāyana belongs to the seventh century B. C. (*IA*. 41, p. 230).[4] The treatment accorded by Bhāsa to these inhabitants shows that they were freed of the taint attached to them and were included in Āryāvarta. Some period must have elapsed between Baudhāyana and Bhāsa for such a change, and two or three centuries would not

---

1 Pāṇini, IV, 3, 100-101. 2 Keith, *SD*, p. 105; Sarup, *Vision*, Intr. p. 37; Arthadyotanikā, a commentary on *Śākuntala* speaks of it. 3 *OC*, V, p. 97, *PB*, 1929, p. 131. For Āpastamba's date, Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, I, p. 45 (600-300 B. C.); Jolly, *Recht und Sitte*, p. 3 (500-400 B. C.). 4 Cf. Bhide, *Svapna*, Intr. pp. 15-17. For Baudhāyana's date, Kane, *Op. Cit.*, p. 30 (500-200 B. C.); Jolly, *Op. Cit.* p. 4 (600-500 B. C.).

be unreasonable. Bhāsa, therefore, comes to somewhere between the fifth and the fourth century B. C.

iii. The *Avimāraka* shows that marriages between prohibited degrees of consanguinity, *e. g.* those with maternal uncle's or aunt's daughter, were recognized in those days. Manu looks down upon such a custom and so does Kumārila. The *Mahābhārata* mentions Arjuna's marriage with his maternal uncle's daughter. So the custom seems to be fairly ancient, testifying to the antiquity of the drama.[1] Perhaps the portion in the present version of the *Manusmṛti* condemning such marriages was not there in ancient times, as the composition of the *Manusmṛti* is placed between the second century B. C. and the second century A. D.

iv. The ethos of the Brahmanical system, glorification of sacrifices, contemptuous attitude towards Buddhists and Jains, point to a period not far off from the origin of these religious systems. Buddhism and Jainism do not seem to have obtained a sway either over the ruling Princes or over the public when these plays were written. This places Bhāsa at a point very near the sixth century B. C.

v. The *Prat*, *Svapna* and *Pratijñā* testify to the fact of *avaguṇṭhana* (veiling) system being current among ladies. The veil could be done away with on some specified occasions.[2] Belief in black art and magic is seen from the *Avi*, and almost the same masters are mentioned as in Kauṭilya.[3] This shows that our poet is at least a contemporary of Kauṭilya, if not earlier, showing thereby, the fourth century B. C. as the later limit.

In dealing at length later on with the sociological conditions as revealed from Bhāsa's works, we have given parallel references from the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* and the *Jātakas* and this shows that Bhāsa belongs to the fifth or the fourth century B. C.

BHARATAVĀKYAS

in these plays are not uniform, except in stating the

---

1 Cf. *Hindu Exogamy*, p. 14, *Gopājātaka*. Kumārila, however, in his *Tantra Vārtika* tries to justify Arjuna's marriage with Subhadrā as she was not, according to Kumārila, Arjuna's Mātula Kanyā. *Śābarabhāṣya*, Vol. I., Poona, p. 210. 2 *Svapna*, p. 140; *Pratijñā*, p. 50; *Prat*, p. 36, also I. 29; *Ūru*, p. 101, v. 38; *Cār*, p. 89. 3 *Avi*, p. 46; *Arthaśāstra*, XIV, 148, p. 419.

territorial limits of the kingdom of a Rājasiṁha. The prayer is varied, being in some परचक्रं प्रणाम्यतु and in others प्रणास्तु नः These variations unmistakably show vicissitudes in the political career of the king and cannot be due to the influence of a particular school. These dramas have already been found to be free from the handling of Kerala dramatists. Hence identification with Pāṇḍya and Pallava kings does not arise.[1] Opinion is almost unanimous over the point that Rājasiṁha is not the proper name of a king. Sten Konow has identified the king with Kṣatrapa, Rudrasiṁha I, Dhruva with Śuṅga Puṣyamitra, Jayaswal with Kāṇva Nārāyaṇa and Bhide with Udāyi.[2] Now the first line of the *Bharatavākyas* indicates that the whole of Northern India, bounded by Vindhya and Himavat, was under the sceptre of one king. The upshot of our investigations on internal evidence shows the fifth or the fourth century B. C. as the period of the poet. Candragupta is said to be the first monarch to bring under his sway the whole of Northern India. But we think that Ugrasena Nanda may be said in a sense to deserve the appellation. MM. Haraprasad Sastri also identifies Rājasiṁha, without mentioning any name, with "one of the Nandas".[3] It will be shown later in this chapter that Bhāsa must be placed before Kauṭilya, and hence before Candragupta also. Therefore, *Bharatavākyas* show the poet to have lived earlier than the fourth century B. C.

The cumulative effect of all the factors considered under 'Internal evidence' is therefore to place the period of these plays between the fifth and the fourth century B. C.

In turning to the EXTERNAL EVIDENCE we are treading on unsettled grounds. Kauṭilya, Kālidāsa and Śūdraka among others, come forward to give testimony in this respect. And there is a sharp controversy regarding their own dates. We have, therefore, followed what appeared to us to be a sound view, and have assigned Kauṭilya to the fourth century B. C., Kālidāsa to the first century B. C., and regarding the date and identification of

---

1 Barnett, *JRAS*, 1919, p. 238; Kavi, *JAHRS*, 2, p. 143; Kane, *VJV*, 1920, p. 99; etc. 2 Konow, *ID*, pp. 51-56; Dhruva, *Svapnavāsavadatta*, Intr., pp. 12, 30-59; Jayaswal, *JASB*, 1913, pp. 264-265; Bhide, *Svapna*, Intr., pp. 40-41. 3 Ganapati Sastri, *Critical Study*, p. 54, footnote. Dr. Ghoshal in fact describes Ugrasena Mahāpadma as "the founder of the first real Indian Empire." (*MR*, Octr. 1930, p. 438). Cf. also Deb, *JASB*, 1933, pp. 349-350; Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect*, 1919, p. 85.

Śūdraka we prefer not to complicate matters by our own conclusions, though it may be stated that Śūdraka appears to have preceded Kālidāsa. In a subsequent chapter we shall prove the priority of the *Cār* to the *Mṛcch* without entering into the discussion of the date and authorship of the latter, as it is not necessary for our purposes.[1]

Now, we have already treated the direct evidence furnished by Bāṇa, Daṇḍin, Abhinavagupta, Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, Śāradātanaya, Bhojadeva, Sāgaranandin and Sarvānanda, which covers a period from the seventh century A. D. to the twelfth century A. D. Other literary references not dealt with earlier, and belonging to this and later periods will, for the sake of convenience, be given in an appendix. Among the references from or to the Trivandrum plays in the works of authors subsequent to Bāṇa, we have dealt with only the important writers as also those about whose quotations there is a difference of opinion. We shall begin with the KUNDAMĀLĀ of DIṄNĀGA (? DHĪRANĀGA) and proceed in an ascending chronological order. The *Kundamālā* at one time was taken to have been composed somewhere in the earlier part of the fifth century A. D., and we also contributed to the view ;[2] but later on, it has been proved that the author of the work is Dhīranāga or Vīranāga, and that no reference to the *Kundamālā* earlier than the 12th century A. D. has been found.[3] A comparison between the *Kundamālā* and *Uttararāmacarita* and a close examination of the two works has convinced us that the author of the *Kundamālā* is the borrower.

In the *Kundamālā*, there is a passage in which पडिमागदो महाराओ is mentioned with regard to Daśaratha.

वच्छ लक्ख(क्ख ?)ण, पणमिदव्वा तुए मम वअणादो राहवउलरायधाणी भअवदी अयोज्झा, सुस्ससिदव्वो पडिमागदो महाराओ, सादिदव्वा अज्जूआ आयत्ति, समस्सासिदव्वा णिअंवदा मम पिअसहीओ, सुमरिदव्वा सव्वकालं मन्दभाइणी ।[4]

Kundamālā, Dakṣiṇa Bh. Series p. 10.

---

1 We have, however, written a short note on the 'Authorship of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*', in Chap. VI. We submitted a paper on the "Authorship and Date of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*" to the Ninth All-India Oriental Conference held at Trivandrum ; the same has been accepted for publication in the *JAHRS*. 2 *Kundamālā*, Dakṣiṇa Bhārati Series, Intr., p. vi ; *JUB*, 2, p. 179. 3 K. A. Subramania Iyer, *Kundamālā and the Uttararāmacarita*, *OC*, VII, pp. 91-97 on p. 97.

4 वत्स लक्ष्मण, प्रणमितव्या त्वया मम वचनाद्राघवकुलराजधानी भगवती अयोध्या, शुश्रूषयितव्यो प्रतिमागतो महाराजः, सान्त्वयितव्या अज्जूकामातृकिः, समाश्वासयितव्या निर्बन्धदा मम प्रियसखयः, स्मर्तव्या सर्वकालं मन्दभागिनी ।

Prof. Mankad takes it as referring to the *Pratimā*.[1] There is absolutely nothing to be found in the *Rāmāyaṇa* about statue-houses, nor is there any other reference in Sanskrit literature excepting the *Prat* that would render पडिमागदो (प्रतिमागतः) intelligible. So we must take in these words a clear reference to the *Prat*. Prof. Kane, on the other hand, finds the above explanation "very far from convincing".[2] Though nothing prevents the author from improving on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, particular reference to the *śuśrūṣā* of प्रतिमागत महाराज reminds one of Bhāsa and all that he says about the upkeep of statue-houses, especially as the latter's works were in circulation at the period in which the *Kundamālā* was composed. With due deference, we beg to differ from Prof. Kane.

VĀMANA in his KĀVYĀLAṀKĀRASŪTRAVṚTTI (IV. 3. 25) quotes a verse :

शरच्चन्द्रांशुगौरेण वातविद्धेन भामिनि ।
काशपुष्पलवेनेदं साध्वपातं मुखं कृतम् ॥

as an instance of *Vyājokti*. The same verse occurs in the *Svapna* IV. 3. with such slight variations, as quoting from memory may involve, for example शराङ्क for चन्द्रांशु, and मम for कृतम्. It will not be denied that the verse in its context in the play serves as a great illustration of *Vyājokti*.

In the first adhyāya of the fifth adhikaraṇa there is found a stanza (IV. 1. 3)

वासां बलिर्भवति मद्गृददेहलीनां
हंसैश्च सारसगणैश्च विलुप्तपूर्वः ।
तास्वेव संप्रति विरूढतृणाङ्कुरासु
बीजावलिः पतति कीटमुखावलीढः ॥

which occurs in the *Cār* (1. 2) and *Mṛcch* (1. 9). That Vāmana was familiar with the *Mṛcch* is seen from another quotation द्यूतं हि नाम पुरुषस्यासिंहासनं राज्यम् । (IV. 3. 23) from the latter. Vāmana's quotation tallies more with the *Cār* than with the *Mṛcch*, and hence it will not be unreasonable to suppose that he quotes from memory from the *Cār*. We have shown in a later chapter that the *Mṛcch* is an enlarged version of the *Cār*, and so the occurrence of that verse in the former does not stand against our

1 *ABI*, 9, pp. 333-334 ; 12, pp. 97-98. 2 *ABI*, 10, p. 155.

conclusion. Vāmana's testimony, therefore, proves the existence of the *Svapna* and *Cār* before the eighth century A. D.

In the second adhyāya of the same adhikaraṇa the passage यो भर्तृपिण्डस्य etc. is cited as an ungrammatical *prayoga* on V. 2. 13, and the correctness of युध्येत् is examined. Now this happens to be the fourth *pāda* of identical verses found in the *Pratijñā* (IV. 2.) and Kauṭilīya *Arthaśāstra* (X. 3, p. 368). Apart from the question whether the verse originally belonged to Bhāsa or Kauṭilya, it would be natural to suppose that Vāmana is quoting from a literary work (*Kāvya*) and not from a work on politics. Besides, we know that Vāmana was acquainted with two other works of Bhāsa (*viz.* the *Svapna* and *Cār*) which proves their existence before the eighth century A. D.

Then comes BHĀMAHA, whom Dr. T. G. Sastri unsuccessfully tries to place in the first century B. C. He belongs to the seventh or the eighth century A. D.[1]

In the fourth pariccheda of his *Kāvyālaṁkāra*, Bhāmaha quotes (*IV*. 42)

हतोऽनेन मम भ्राता मम पुत्रः पिता मम ।
मातुलो भागिनेयश्च हृता संरब्धचेतसः ॥

as an instance of Nyāyavirodha. This has been taken to refer to the following speech of Haṁsaka from the *Pratijñā* (p. 13)[2]:—

अणेण मम भादा हदो, अणेण मम पिदा, अणेण मम सुदो, मम व अस्स त्ति ।

Bhāmaha gives the whole situation in stanzas 38-45 of the same pariccheda, and it will clearly show that it is quite different from that detailed in the *Pratijñā*. To give only a few notable differences: the elephant as described in the work criticized by Bhāmaha is a faked one covered by leather, while that in Bhāsa is real; the soldiers are placed in the body of the mechanical elephant by Bhāmaha's author, while in Bhāsa they are concealed in surrounding thickets; Vatsarāja in Bhāmaha's author is fighting alone, Bhāsa places twenty soldiers with him; the incident takes place according to Bhāmaha's author

1 Kane, *Sāhitya Darpaṇa*, Intr., pp. XXV.-XLI on p. XXXIX; Raddi Sastri, *VJV*, 47, pp. 222-225; Hirananda Sastri, *MASI*, 28, pp. 12-18. 2 G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, pp. 21-22; Sarup, Vision, Intr., p. 40; Banerji Sastri, *JBORS*, 1923, pp. 79-80; Sankar, *AMV*, 2, p. 45.

on the boundary of Vatsa country, while in the *Pratijñā* it takes place in the Nāgavana of Avanti. Thus it is clear that Bhāmaha directs his criticism against a different work and not the *Pratijñā*. Years ago, Prof. Kane suggested that the criticism referred to the *Bṛhatkathā*.[1] But now thanks to the publication of the MSS of different works from the South, we are in a position to identify the work which formed the object of Bhāmaha's attack. It seems that the criticism applies in all particulars to the incidents as described in the *Viṇāvāsavadatta* (being published in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras) which, as we have shown, may be the *Unmāda*. The situation and incidents mentioned by Bhāmaha are all found in the Viṇā. The similarity between Bhāmaha and the *Pratijñā*, as noted by Prof. Dhruva, is merely 'accidental'.[2]

Mr. V. Venkatarama Sarma in his introduction to the *Abhiṣeka* (p. v) states that ILANKOVADIGAL in the CILAPPADIKARAM, an ancient Tamil poem of the second century A. D., mentions one *Bālacarita Nāṭaka*, which treats of the story of Śrīkṛṣṇa in the following words:—"mayavanudan rammu n a d i y a *Bālacaritainātakangalil* venedunkat Pinnai y o d a d i y a kuravai yadutum". (Cilappadikaram edited by M. Svaminatha Aiyer, 1920, Madras, page 442). We are obliged to Mr. Sankar for supplying us with a transliteration and translation of the passage.[3] For easy reference we herewith append his transliteration and translation:—"Āyarpāḍiyil erumanrattu Māyavan uḍan tan mun āḍiya *bālacaritai-nāṭakangalil* vel neḍum kaṭ Piññaiyoḍu āḍiya kuravai āḍutum yām enrāl". He translates: "She said, 'let us dance the Kuravai dance, which Kṛṣṇa of old in Gokula on the refuse-heap danced with Pinnai of lance-long eyes, among the many dances played with him and before him in the frolic of childhood". Mr. Sankar further writes that there is no reference to the *Bālacarita*, and that two commentators support him in his interpretation. Prof. Dikshitar also thinks likewise.[4] The passage speaks of the Kuravai dance which Kṛṣṇa of old danced in Gokula. Being quite ignorant of the S o u t h e r n

1 *VJV*, 1930, p. 98; also *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, Intr., pp. XXXVIII-XXXIX.
2 *Pradhānasat Pratijñā*, p. 27. 3 In his letter dated 7-8-32. 4 In his letter dated 25-10-34.

vernaculars, we are not competent to hazard any guess; but supported as we are by a South Indian Scholar, we think that the word '*Bālacarita*' in the passage is purposely used, suggesting the drama of that name.

It may be contended that the reference may be to another *Bālacarita*; but we have not yet come across any other *Bālacarita*, and again, especially in dramatic literature two works bearing identical titles are not found. We think there is no reason to infer the existence of another *Bāl* by Bhāsa dealing with Rāma's childhood. The verse quoted by Viśvanātha in his *Sāhityadarpaṇa* as from a *Bālacarita*, *viz.*

उत्साहातिशयं वत्स तव बाल्यं च पश्यतः ।
मम हर्षविषादाभ्यामाक्रान्तं युगपन्मनः ॥

(Kane's Edition, App. E., p. 73).

may very well find a place in our play. It is the commentator of the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* that has given the reference (which made MM. Dr. G. Sastri to postulate the existence of another *Bāl* by *Bhāsa*)[1] in his prefatory remarks attached to the verse, which read as follows :— रामं प्रति परशुरामस्योक्तिरियम्[2] and it is quite possible that he may not be right. The reference ought to have been दामोदरं प्रति संकर्षणस्योक्तिरियम्। We locate the stanza उत्साहातिशयं etc. in our text at p. 42 after the last speech by Dāmodara and before the stage direction (संकर्षणस्तैः सह निष्क्रान्तः।) There is an occasion for the concern shown by Saṁkarṣaṇa for the safety of Dāmodara: Cf. again अलमलं भयविषादाभ्याम् in Saṁkarṣaṇa's speech on page 49; and further, Dāmodara has been addressed as 'Vatsa' by Saṁkarṣaṇa. So we think the verse fits in well with the context shown and hence the commentator on the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* is unhappily wrong. There are many instances of such mistakes by commentators.[3] Thus, assigning a suitable

1 *Critical Study*, p. 21. 2 Khuperkar, however, reads दशरथस्य for परशुरामस्य in रामं प्रति परशुरामस्योक्तिरियम्। (*Lokaśikṣaṇa*, 5, p. 326). cf. also the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, com. Rāmacarana, Bombay, 1922, p. 304. 3 There are many instances of similar mistakes by commentators, *e. g.* at. 95 from Dāmodaragupta's *Kuṭṭinīmata* has been quoted in the *Kāvya Prakāśa* (X. 452) as an illustration of Atiśayokti, but most of the commentators on the *Kāvya Prakāśa* are wrong in tracing the quotation. According to Kamalākara Bhaṭṭa, the verse is from the *Mālati-Mādhava*, while Maheśvara wrongly reading Mālavi for Malati in the verse, refers it to the *Mālavikāgnimitra*. देवीमावं गमिता etc. is given in the *Kāvya Prakāśa* (X. 453) as an illustration of Prativastūpamā; but one commentator takes the verse as the speech of Vatsarāja to Ratnāvali, while another takes it as the lamentation of the Pāṇḍavas after Draupadi was engaged as Sairandhri. Prof. Pansikar has given many instances in his introduction to the *Pratimā*, pp. XX-XXIII.

place for the verse obviates the necessity of an awkward inference (of the existence of two dramatic works bearing identical titles), which these very Bhāsaites were at pains to dislodge while dealing with the *Svapna*.

Further, our *Bāl* is known as the earliest version of the Kṛṣṇa story on account of the absence of the erotic element which is a characteristic of the later description of Rādhā and Gopīs.[1] Dr. Konow would "safely ascribe the *Bāl* to an early date".[2] In view of these statements therefore, and also on account of the absence of another *Bāl*, we think, we are not far from right in taking the Tamil work as referring to our *Bāl*.

Aśvaghoṣa's date is not yet settled, but none would place him later than the second century A. D. Aśvaghoṣa's BUDDHACARITA contains one verse (XIII. 60):

काष्ठं हि मथ्नन् लभते हुताशं भूमिं खनन् विन्दति चापि तोयम्।
निर्वेन्धिनः किञ्चन नास्त्यसाध्यं न्यायेन युक्तं च कृतं च सर्वम्॥

which is almost identical in expression with Bhāsa's *Pratijñā* (I. 18):

काष्ठाद्भिर्जायते मथ्यमानाद् भूमिस्तोयं खन्यमाना ददाति।
सोत्साहानां नास्त्यसाध्यं नराणां मार्गारब्धाः सर्वयत्नाः फलन्ति॥

In considering and evaluating these verses we are treading on delicate grounds where there is an ample scope for difference of opinion. It is a matter of taste only. Aesthetic beauty of a particular verse can be appreciated by some, while it may fail to appeal to others. Thus, in the present case, Dr. Sastri takes Bhāsa's verse to be original from its easy and graceful flow; while Mr. Sankar takes Aśvaghoṣa's verse to be free and direct.[3] Subjective considerations, therefore, must be supplemented by other objective reasons. Prakrits of Bhāsa show an earlier period; and the profuse use of short metres and pre-Bharata dramatic technique are in favour of the priority of Bhāsa to Aśvaghoṣa.

Next, we come to Kālidāsa.[4] The celebrated poet

---

1 Weller, *Die Abenteuer des Knaben Krischna*, trans., Intr., p. 13. 2 *IA*, 49, p. 234. 3 G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, p. 48; Sankar, *AMV*, 2, p. 53. 4 To do some justice to the problem of the date of Kālidāsa at least 100 pages will be required, and the determination of the date in detail is not thought necessary. Main lines of our argument will merely be indicated here with reference to the recent contributions on the subject. There was a difference of some 1200 years between the earliest and latest dates assigned to Kālidāsa but the Mandasore inscription rules out

in the prologue to the *Mālavikāgnimitra* pays a tribute to Bhāsa of 'established renown'. His use of वर्तमान कवि in describing himself in contradistinction to Bhāsa and other famous poets indicates the lapse of a considerable period between the two. Further, there are to be seen many faint Bhāsa echoes in the works of Kālidāsa.[1] Court life of the kings in Bhāsa is much simpler than in the plays of Kālidāsa.[2] These tend to show that Bhāsa was quite well known by the first century B. C. and hence was considerably earlier.

Then comes Śūdraka,[3] the author of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. There occur various similarities, conceptual and verbal, between the *Cār* and the *Mṛcch*, and in a later chapter we have attempted to prove the priority of the *Cār* to the *Mṛcch*.

Finally, we come to Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, which, according to us, places us in possession of the later limit for the date of Bhāsa. We prefer to follow Prof. Kane,

---

all dates subsequent to the 5th century A. D. Prof. Shembavanekar's articles on the subject (*JUB*, 1, pp. 232-246) sets many doubts at rest, and clearly shows the existence of a Vikramāditya, son of Mahendrāditya, in the 1st century B. C., confirming the traditional date. Cowell's theory as to the indebtedness of Kālidāsa, was vitiated by the presumption of the priority of Aśvaghoṣa and the comparisons by Prof. Chattopadhyaya (*All. Univ. Studies*, 2,pp.80-114) and Prof. Ray (*Śākuntala*, Intr., pp. 19-28) conclusively proves Kālidāsa to be the model and fountain of inspiration for Aśvaghoṣa. Dr. Pathak's theory about the Hūṇas based on a wrong variant, and again, it is shown that the Hūṇas were known to the Indians from pretty early times (*JUB*, 1, p. 245: *All. Univ. Studies*, pp. 126-133; *JIH*, 15, pp.93-102 *Śākuntala*, Intr., p.81. It is not necessary to take the *Meghadūta* as the work of another Kālidāsa as Prof. Dhruva argues (*Parākramaṅkī Prasādi*, Intr., pp.25-27; *Thakkar Lecture*, pp. 229-236). Dinnāga theory is also untenable on various grounds (Chattopadhyaya, *All. Univ. Studies*, pp. 164-167). *Kaumudī Mahotsava* (Dasaratha Sarma, *IHQ*, 10, pp. 763-766; 11, pp. 147-148; *OC*, VIII, Summaries, pp. 25-26; Mankad, *ABI*, 16, pp. 155-157) and *Padyacūḍāmaṇi* (Intr. by K. Sastri) also confirm the first century B. C. theory. The religious, social, political, astronomical etc., conditions, as well as the language and Prakrit evidence (Ray, *Śākuntala*, Intr., pp. 1-19; 28-30; Vaidya, *Lokaśikṣana*, 7, pp. 9-17; K. Ray, *Evolution of Gītā*, pp. 201-222, Dhruva, *Thakkar Lectures*, pp. 207-213; and Apte, Kane, Paranjape, etc.) point to the same period. Prof. Shembavanekar's article further brings out the hollowness of the Gupta theory in that the Guptas were avowed Vaiṣnavas (*JUB*, 1, p. 238); Candragupta II was not the first Vikramāditya (Ib. p. 280); all the śāstras that Kālidāsa was acquainted with belong to the pre-Gupta, even the pre-Christian period (Ib. p. 241); beyond a few isolated inscriptions there is no literary composition that can authoritatively be ascribed to the Gupta period, 'the Augustan period of Sanskrit literature' (Ib. p. 242). Thus the first century B. C. theory must be accepted, as stated by Prof. Shembavanekar, "until some historical evidence of an unimpeachable character is brought to light" (Ib. p. 245).

1 G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, pp. 35-36, 40-47; Paranjape, *Sāhityasaṅgraha*, I, pp. 157-160. 2 Winternitz, *Problems*, p. 122. 3 Many orientalists seem to hold the opinion that Śūdraka preceded Kālidāsa: cf. Belvalkar, *OC*, I, p. 204; Konow, *ID*, p. 57; Winternitz, *CR*, Dec. 1934, p. 334; V. Smith, *EHI*, p. 324n; Kavi, *Avantisundarīkathā*, Intr. pp. 8-10; *Caturbhāṇi*, Intr., pp. ii-iii; etc. The view of some European orientalists that the *Mṛcch* was the earliest Sanskrit drama also tells the same story.

Dr. Bhandarkar, Dr. Jayaswal, Dr. N. N. Law, Dr. Ganapati Sastri, Dr. Jacobi and a number of other scholars in identifying Kauṭilya with the Brahmin minister of Candragupta Maurya of the fourth century B. C.[1] It is interesting to note in this connection that those of the pro-Bhāsaites who assign a late date for Kauṭilya regard Bhāsa's verse as the original source; while Kauṭilya is credited with originality by those who place him in the fourth century B. C.[2] The passage :

अपीह श्लोकौ भवतः—

यान् यज्ञसङ्स्तपसा च विप्राः स्वर्गेषिणः पात्रचयैश्च यान्ति ।
क्षणेन तानप्यतियान्ति शूराः प्राणान् सुयुद्धेषु परित्यजन्तः ॥
नवं शरावं सलिलस्य पूर्णं सुसंस्कृतं दर्भकृतोत्तरीयम् ।
तत्तस्य मा मूढरवं च गच्छेद् यो मर्तृपिण्डस्य कृते न युध्येत् ॥

(Arthaśāstra, X. 3, pp. 367-368)

occurs as a quotation in the *Arthaśāstra*, but the source is not mentioned. It is presumed by some that the quotation may be from a Smṛti now lost.[3] The second verse occurs in the *Pratijñā* (IV. 2) in the same connection as a war-song to encourage the soldiers. It would seem fairly unlikely at first sight that Cāṇakya should quote from a piece of dramatic literature. But at times we meet with proverbial sayings from dramas in non-secular scientific works given as pramāṇas ; *e. g.* सतां हि सन्देहपदेषु वस्तुषु etc. in the *Tantravārtika* of Kumārila.[4] Kauṭilya found the quotation quite appropriate and hence incorporated it in his book. Had the quotation been from a Smṛti, the author would certainly have mentioned the name of the Smṛti or at least in general terms इति स्मृतौ. The inference as to *Manunīti* being the source of Kauṭilya arose out of the suggestion of a commentator on the *Arthaśāstra* ; but the commentator seems to be venturing a guess "which is not based on any authority".[5] The evidence of the

---

1 Kane, *ABI*, 7, pp. 85-100 ; Bhandarkar, *ABI*, 7, pp. 65-84 ; Jayaswal, *Hindu Polity*, App. I ; Ganapati Sastri *Critical Study*, p. 25 ; Dikshitar, *Mauryan Polity*, p. 19 ; Śāma Sastri, *Arthaśāstra*, Intr., and preface to the translation, pp. VII-XXXIII ; Fleet, *Arthaśāstra*, Eng. trans., 1929, pp. V-VI ; Thomas, *CHI*, 1, pp. 467-ff. R. Mukerjee, *Studies in Indian Polity*, preface. 2 Sarup, Kauṭilya (2nd century A. D.) the borrower, *Vision*, Intr., p. 41 ; Keith, Kauṭilya (4th century A. D.) the borrower, *SD*, p. 102 ; Banerji Sastri, Kauṭilya (4th century B. C.) the original, *JBORS*, 1923, p. 65 ; Sankar, Kauṭilya (4th century B. C.) the original, *AMV*, 2, p. 52. 3 R. Kavi, *OC*, III. p. 82 ; Kuppuswami Sastri, *Aśvaryo*, Intr., pp. 22-23. 4 *Śābarabhāṣya*, Vol. I., Ānandāśrama S. S., Poona, No. 97, p. 207 *f*. सतां हि सन्देहपदेषु वस्तुषु occurs in *Śākuntala*, I. 19. 5 Dikshitar, *Hindu Adm. Ins*, p. 126 n.2. It is interesting to note that Dr. Jayaswal also approved this

Pratimā where Kauṭilya is not mentioned but his predecessor Bṛhaspati is enumerated, is against the priority of the latter.

Thus the external evidence places the fourth century B. C. as the later limit.

The cumulative effect of the internal and external evidence is to place Bhāsa in the fifth or the fourth century B. C. Dr. Banerji Sastri has considered Bhāsa's priority to Vātsyāyana and Bharata, but disputes his priority to Manu, Kauṭilya etc.[1] Bhāsa is certainly later than Manu (*i.e. Mānavīya Dharmaśāstra*) but not the *Manusmṛti* as we have it at present.

"ARGUMENTUM EX SILENTIO"

by itself is possibly of no avail. If it supports the date arrived at by other sources, the argument would derive some force. The silence must be of such a type as not to be explicable except on the ground of priority of the writer to the facts about which he is silent. There must, further, be a definite occasion for the poet or the writer to mention the fact on which he happens to be silent. In Bhāsa, the non-mention of the following things indicates the antiquity of the author.

The first thing that would strike a student of Bhāsa in this connection is that all the characters of his plays are Northerners. Not only that; the place of action also is mostly North India, the only exceptions being the Rāma plays, where the action takes place in the South. Only one place and one mountain is all that our poet knows of the topography of the South. Now we know that in Aśoka's time much of Southern India was known, and that the mission headed by his son Mahendra penetrated as far as Ceylon. Tāmraparṇī is mentioned in Rock Edicts II and XIII, which also refer to Ceylon.[2] Māmulanār, an ancient Tamil author, speaks of the Mauryan invasions in the past as far as Tinnevelly District. Greek writers and some Mysore inscriptions suggest "that the first Maurya did conquer a considerable portion of trans-Vindhyan India".[3] Our poet on the

view about the quotation in the *Arthaśāstra* while reviewing Prof. Dikshitar's work in the *Modern Review*, 1930, June, p. 73.

1 *JBORS*, 1923, pp. 66-67, 76-77. 2 Roy Chaudhuri, *PHAI*, 2nd edition, p. 208; Contra, Smith, *Aśoka*, 3rd edition, p. 162. 3 Roy Chaudhuri, *PHAI*, 2nd edition, p. 168.

contrary betrays a thorough ignorance of the country beyond Narmadā. Hence it is not unreasonable to suppose him to have flourished before Candragupta's conquest of the South.[1]

Whenever our poet has to convey the sense of a coin, he uses the word *Suvarṇa* or *Suvarṇamāṣaka* and not *Nāṇaka* which is found to be current in the later literature. Coins as such were unknown in ancient India, and as observed by Mr. Sankar, the word *Nāṇaka* was named from the Elamite Goddess Nanaia, who first appears in India on Kaniṣka's coins, *i. e.*, 150 A. D.[2] Some maintain that the coins of Kauśāmbī date from the third century B. C. Latest researches in numismatics have shown that coins were struck in India from very early times. So the period of Bhāsa is considerably earlier, there being no coins properly so called, but only pieces of gold of particular weights in his time.

The silence of Bhāsa as to the solar signs of Zodiac (*rāśis*) also shows high antiquity. Bhāsa mentions *nakṣatras* that are of Indian origin but excludes the mention of *rāśis* in that connection, though on proper occasions. *Rāśis* find a place in Hindu astrology through Hellenic influence. Kauṭilīya *Arthaśāstra* (fourth century B. C.) is also ignorant of *rāśis*. Astronomical references in Kauṭilya are pre-Greek and entirely Indian. *Rāśis* were first included in Hindu astrology not before the fourth century B. C.,[3] and hence Bhāsa is much earlier than the Greek contact with India.

Bhāsa refers to Jain mendicants in the following words :

जदि वत्थं अवणेमि समणओ होमि। *(Avi, p. 85).*

That Śramaṇaka means a non-Brahmin, seems to follow

---

1 The recent excavations in Sind clearly show that the ancient inhabitants of the Indus Valley had trade relations and maritime intercourse with the whole world including the Southern India (*Mohenjo-Dāro and the Indus Civilization* (Ch. XXVI (p. 546) ; XXVIII (pp. 563-564) ; XXXIII (pp. 675, 676, 678, 680, 683). In face of this it seems rather strange that the Indian writers of the pre-Mauryan period should betray a lamentable ignorance of the countries beyond the Narmadā. It seems probable that the mercantile community and the trading guilds held this knowledge in the Indus Valley period and the general populace was in the dark beyond the Northern India bounded by the Himālayas and the Vindhya range. Further after the desertion of the Indus Valley due to natural or political upheaval no memory of the past remained and the people were confined to their own houses. 2 *AMV*, 2, p. 62 ; Cf. Kulkarni, *Sanskrit Drama and Dramatists*, p. 100 ; Deb, *JASB*, 1933, p. 345 n2. 3 Ray, *MR*, 1929, p. 254 ; Vaidya, *Mbh, Upasaṁhāra*, pp. 42-47.

from the way they are spoken of (*Pratijñā*, p. 43, अयं चक्षणभावं। ईदामत्तएण समणएण अभव्वं दीक्खदि। p., 46, एदेण ईदामत्तएण समणएण....). In the *Avi* (p. 84) also, 'Śramaṇaka' is used in contrast to Brāhmaṇa. The remark of the Vidūṣaka quoted above (जदि चत्थं अवणेमि etc.) clearly points to there being Digambara Jainas. As nakedness has been specified as a characteristic of Jaina Śramaṇakas, it follows that the writer was not aware of the other sect of Jainas, the Śvetāmbara sect. The great schism dividing the community originated at about 300 B. C.,[1] and Bhāsa is certainly to be placed prior to this period, as he knows but one sect of the Jainas.

Generally speaking, it may be safely said that these plays are free from Greek influence, as is evident from non-mention of many terms and ideas, as also the absence of the royal paraphernalia that found place in the Indian literature after Greek contact.

It would be found that in all these cases, the inference of the priority of our poet from his non-mention or silence as to the above facts is a necessary one. The cumulative effect of all the arguments ex silentio is to place our plays in a pre-Mauryan period, and the internal and external evidence also point at the same period. Taking the *Bharatavākyas* into account, Bhāsa may be posted to the period of Ugrasena Mahāpadmananda, 'the precursor of Candragupta Maurya',[2] or may be taken to be a senior contemporary of the great Maurya. Prof. Dikshitar on the strength of the arguments adduced by two learned Mahāmahopādhyāyas Ganapati Sastri and Haraprasad Sastri, also arrives at the same date.[3] The difference of many centuries between the various dates assigned to Bhāsa by different protagonists arises out of the atmosphere of uncertainty about the dates of Kālidāsa, Śūdraka and Kauṭilya. There is also a good deal of difference of opinion as to the priority or posteriority of Bhāsa to Aśvaghoṣa. If universally accepted dates could be found for Kauṭilya, Śūdraka, Kālidāsa and Aśvaghoṣa, there will be no possibility of any difference as to the date

---

1 *CHI*, p. 165. 2 Roy Chaudhuri, *PHAI*, 2nd edition, p. 163; also MM. Haraprasad Sastri quoted in the *Pratimā*, G. Sastri's Intr., p. 15; Dr. Upendranath Ghoshal, *MR*, Octr, 1930, p. 438; Deb, *JASB*. 1933, pp. 349-350. 3 *The Mauryan Polity*, pp. 18-19; G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, pp. 74-75, 54 footnote; Haraprasad Sastri, *JBORS*, 5, p. 560.

of Bhāsa, his priority, at least to Kālidāsa and Śūdraka being beyond doubt. Thus it is that we place Bhāsa in the pre-Mauryan epoch, Kauṭilya being the later limit for the date of Bhāsa.

CHAPTER IV.

CRITICAL STUDY.

Under this and the next chapter we shall study the poet and the plays under different topics. In a subsequent chapter will be given the plots and general features of the plays—a sort of running commentary on the plays.

1. TEXT MATERIAL OF THE PLAYS.

In his introduction to the *Svapna*, MM. Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri gave details of his tour for the search of MSS, in the course of which he "came across a palm-leaf MS of *Nāṭakas* in the Manalikkara Matham near Padmanābhapuram".[1] The MS was over three hundred years old and contained one hundred and five leaves written in Malayalam characters. In subsequent tours different MSS of the *Svapna* and other plays were found. Dr. Sastri brought out a critical edition of the plays discussing variant readings in the foot-notes.

In view of the date we have assigned to Bhāsa, the texts certainly do not represent the original plays. It would be interesting to get the original MSS and to see the script and characters in which they were written. It is certainly not impossible to come across the originals, judging from a similar case of Aśvaghoṣa. The texts presented to us probably represent southern versions, which in Pischel's opinion "present abridged and otherwise interpolated recensions."[2] There is also no *warranty* for taking the northern (Bengali) recensions as preserving the texts with absolute fidelity ; they might have modified the texts "perhaps to a lesser degree."[3] Prof. K. R. Pisharoti speaks very slightingly of the printed Trivandrum texts and pronounces them as "cooked up" by the editor, who, according to the Professor, was "ignorant of the manuscript traditions of the land",[4] It may be noted,

1 *Svapna*, Intr., p. 1. 2 *JRAS*, 1927, p. 868. 3 *JRAS*, 1927, p. 868.
4 *IHQ*, 5, p. 557.

that with this single exception, the Trivandrum editor has not been accused of manufacturing texts. Dr. Keith, on the other hand, seems to attach much value to the Trivandrum texts as 'critical editions' while denouncing the Indian editions *e. g.*, that of the *Āścarya* as not having "even the value of manuscripts".[1]

There are editions of the *Bāl*, *Pañc*, *Svapna*, *Prat*, *Abh* etc. brought out by different writers, but they are generally based on the Trivandrum texts.[2] Dr. Weller has brought out, for instance, an edition in Devanāgarī characters of the *Bālacarita*, but for the most part he follows Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri's emendations and *chāyā*. "In a number of passages Dr. Weller has introduced corrections of his own or has followed some valuable suggestions of Prof. Jacobi. ....To a certain extent he has regularized the Prakrit spellings".[3] This also proves the value of the Trivandrum texts. Prof. Pisharoti in translating the *Svapna*, *Prat*, *Avi*, *Dgh*, *Karṇa*, and *Abh* has given variant readings from other manuscripts available to him.[4] Prof. Dhruva in his Gujarati translations of the *Mv*, *Svapna* and *Pratijñā* proposes various emendations, and has brought out a Sanskrit text of the *Prat*; but the emendations are only conjectural, not supported by manuscripts. The editions of the *Svapna* and *Abh* brought out respectively by Dr. Sarup and Pandit Venkatarama Sarma are based on different manuscripts from the South. But they do not offer any material variations from the Trivandrum texts.

It was confidently hoped that many manuscripts of similar nāṭakas would be 'discovered' in the South;[5] but the difficulties experienced by Dr. Raja in getting even one more manuscript, necessitating his reliance on a single manuscript for the publication of the Viṇā effectively answers those entertaining the h o p e.[6] Government Oriental MSS Library in Madras, the Palace Libraries in the South as well as some of the College and University Libraries now possess MSS of the Trivandrum Bhāsa plays. The Bhandarkar Institute of

---

1 Keith, *HSL*, p. XII n3. 2 All references can be found in 'Bibliography-A,-'Text editions and Translations' given towards the end of the book. 3 Thomas, *Id.*, 1923, p.186. 4 Full references in 'Bibliography-A' 5 Cf. A. K. Pisharoti, *Criticism*, pp. 39-40; Raja, *JOR*, 10, 1936, supplement, p.11. 6 *JOR*, Dec. 1936, supplement, pp. 1-11.

Poona and the School of Oriental Studies, London, have also secured MSS of the Bhāsa plays in their collection.[1] It is said that even now it is possible to procure manuscripts from private collections, if a thorough search is made. That is, of course, a difficult task.

2. SOURCES OF THE PLAYS.

In considering the sources of the plays we shall adopt the following order :—

i. The *Mahābhārata* plays : *Mv, Dv, Dgh, Karṇa, Ūru and Pañc.*
ii. The Kṛṣṇa plays : *Bāl.*
iii. The *Rāmāyaṇa* plays : *Prat* and *Abh.*
iv. Udayana plays : *Pratijñā* and *Svapna.*
v. Legendary plays ; *Cār* and *Avi.*

(*i*) Turning to the *Mahābhārata* plays first, we find in general that the poet is much indebted to the epic. In the one-act plays, "some short episode is taken from the *Mahābhārata* and freely dramatized".[2]

The *Madhyama Vyāyoga*, according to Dr. Keith, has "a reminiscence of the tale of the love of the demon Hiḍimbā for Bhīma", while Pavolini points out that the Bakavadha Parva of the *Mbh* is used.[3] We are, however, inclined to follow Prof. Dhruva who divides the story of the *Mv* into the main plot and the by-plot, taking the reunion of Bhīma and Hiḍimbā as the *mukhya-kathā* and the story of Keśavadāsa as an *upakathā*.[4] No trace of the former being found in the *Mbh*, it is said to be of the poet's own creation ; while Śunaḥśepākhyāna in the *Aitareya*, VII. 3, is sought to be the original for the Brahmin story that is woven into the main story.

The *Dūtavākya*, a Vyāyoga in one act, is again from the *Mbh*, but deals with the Kṛṣṇa legend. The fact of Kṛṣṇa being sent as a messenger for peace negotiations is mentioned in *Mbh*, Udyogaparva, Adhyāyas 94, 95,

---

1 Vide Nos.35 (*Avimāraka*), and 36 (*Bālacarita*) of 1925-26 ; and Nos. 6 (*Svapna*), 7 (*Dūtaghaṭotkaca*), 8 (*Ūrubhaṅga*), 9 (*Madhyamavyāyoga*), 10 (*Karṇabhāra*), and 11 (*Pratijñā*) of 1926-27 in the MSS. collection of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. The Institute possesses transcripts in Devanagari characters of these and some other Bhāsa plays. My authority for the statement in connection with the School of Oriental Studies, London, is Mahopādhyāya Pandit Venkatarama Sarma of Madras. 2 Winternitz, *Problems*, p. 111. 3 *SD*, p. 95. The reference is to *Mbh*, 1, Adh. 160-161 (Bakavadha Parva). 4 *Madhyama*, second edition, pp. 12-13 ; 13-16.

124 and 131. There is the description of a picture depicting the denuding of Draupadī at the time of the gambling episode. The description does not mention the miracle by which Kṛṣṇa himself supplies Draupadī with the garments as each one is taken off. Omission of this detail has led Dr. Winternitz to assume that "this miracle of garments is a very late interpolation".[1] The conclusion seems unwarranted as the omission may be deliberate, since its mention would have made Duryodhana enjoy the sight of his own shame; further, as observed by Dr. Keith, this omission may be due "to the difficulty of exhibiting this by the painter's art".[2] The embassy (of Kṛṣṇa) has been dramatized to glorify Kṛṣṇa and proclaim his identity with Vāsudeva, Nārāyaṇa and Viṣṇu. The scene about the various divine weapons appearing in human form is a speciality of Bhāsa.

The *Dūtaghaṭotkaca* depicts Ghaṭotkaca as an envoy to the Kauravas and predicts their punishment at the hands of Arjuna. Ghaṭotkaca delivers the message of Kṛṣṇa to Dhṛtarāṣṭra. As no such incident appears in the *Mbh*, of Ghaṭotkaca going as the envoy either after the death of Abhimanyu (as told in the drama) or at any other time, the plot seems to have been the poet's invention, the epic having supplied him with the characters only.

The *Karṇabhāra* follows the epic in the main. Karṇa details the story of his obtaining the *astras* from Paraśurāma, which occurs in the *Karṇaparva*, Adhyāya 42, and *Śāntiparva*, Ahdyāyas 2-3. The main incident of Karṇa giving away his armour to Indra in disguise is found in the *Mbh*, *Vanaparva*, Adhyāya 310, and *Śāntiparva*, Adhyāya 5. Bhāsa has transposed the incident occurring in the forest to the battlefield, has changed the characters of Karṇa and Śalya making them more noble and saintly than in the epic, and introduced minor changes.

The *Ūrubhaṅga* has for its basis the *Śalyaparva*, Adhyāyas 56-58, with slight changes, describing the fight of Duryodhana and Bhīma. In the play, Śrīkṛṣṇa throws a suggestion to Bhīma by patting his thigh to

---

1 Winternitz, *HIL*, 1, p. 344 n 2; *Festschrift Kuhn*, pp. 299 ff. 2 *SD*. p. 98.

strike Duryodhana on the thigh, while in the epic it is Arjuna (*Mbh.* IX. 58. 21). The epic does not speak of the dialogue between Balarāma and Duryodhana; Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Gāndhārī were at Hastināpura and not on the battle-field as depicted in the drama. Such changes are the poet's own inventions for dramatic purposes.

The *Pañcarātra* is a play in three acts, dealing with the incidents that are told in the *Virāṭaparva* of the *Mbh.* The raid on cows, (Adhyāyas 35-69), the slaughter of the Kīcakas hinted in the *Pañc* (Adh. 22-24) and the marriage of Abhimanyu with Uttarā (Adh. 71-72) are related in the *Mbh.* The poet has taken considerable liberties with the epic story, and the sacrifice of Duryodhana, the promise to grant half the kingdom to the Pāṇḍavas on their news being heard of within five nights, and Abhimanyu's siding with Duryodhana, are among the main changes introduced by the poet.

It will thus be seen that the *Mahābhārata* serves as a source for nearly all the plays, but the originality of the poet is seen at various places, in inventing new situations and episodes, or in investing the epic heroes with new characteristics.

(*ii*) Coming next to the Kṛṣṇa drama, the *Bālacarita*, we find that there are grounds for difference of opinion. It cannot, of course, be denied as Dr. Weller has said, that the absence of the erotic element indicates an early version of the Kṛṣṇa story as the source of our play.[1] Dr. Sarup indicates the source as the *Harivaṁśa* and Prof. Dhruva also holds a similar view.[2] But in view of the date we have assigned to Bhāsa, *viz.* 4th or 5th century B. C., it seems difficult to recognize as the source, the *Harivaṁśa* which has been placed in the third century A. D., as it uses the word Dīnāra.[3] Further, the drama differs widely in detail from the stories of Kṛṣṇa in the *Harivaṁśa*. So it is necessary to look elsewhere for the source of the *Bāl.* The *Viṣṇu*

---

1 *Die Abenteuer des Knaben Krischna*, German Translation, Intr., p. 13; also Sten Konow, *IA*, 49, p. 234; Woolner and Sarup, *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Vol. 2, p. 109; Winternitz, *CR*, Dec. 1924, p. 331. The bearing of the latest article by Dr. Winternitz on the *Bāl* (*BBRI*, 5, pp. 1-15) is considered in a subsequent chapter. 2 *HR*, 50, p. 120; also Dhruva, *Madhyama*, second edition, Intr., p. 5; Tataka, *MS*, 5, p. 164. 3 Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism etc.*, p. 36.

and *Bhāgavata Purāṇas* also are ruled out as "none of these works as we have it, is probably older than Bhāsa."[1] But we have already found Bhāsa to be indebted to the epic, of which the *Harivaṁśa* forms an appendix. It seems therefore that his source for the Kṛṣṇa story was an earlier version on which the *Harivaṁśa* and the *Purāṇas* are based. As in the *Dv*, the weapons appear in human form in the *Bāl* also.

(*iii*) Out of the *Rāmāyaṇa* plays, the *Pratimā* draws its inspiration from the second and third books of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The poet takes only the story, but builds a superstructure of his own. The statue-house, the genealogy of Rāma, the abduction of Sītā by Rāvaṇa under the guise of an expert on *Śrāddha*, and the absence of Lakṣmaṇa at the time, and Rāma's coronation in the penance forest are the poet's departures from the epic. He has further presented Rāma, Sītā, Daśaratha, Bharata, Kaikeyī, etc. on a higher level than in the epic.

The *Abhiṣeka Nāṭaka* deals with the story as given in the Kiṣkindhā, Sundara, and Yuddha Kāṇḍas of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and follows the epic very closely.[2] The most striking divergence from the epic, however, is the manner in which the waters of the ocean are divided to provide way for the Lord. The *Abh* deals with the consecration of Rāma and according to Dr. Keith, "is a somewhat dreary summary of the corresponding books (4-6) of the *Rāmāyaṇa*".[3] Hence we may conclude with a good deal of certainty that the story in the epic is the mainstay for the two Rāma plays. "It seems possible that our dramatist had known only the older or shorter redaction of the epos which did not include the Bālakāṇḍa and the Uttarakāṇḍa".[4]

(*iv*) Coming to the Udayana or historical plays, we find it asserted that the *Bṛhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya is the source of Bhāsa.[5] The work being referrable to the first century B. C., conflicts with the date we have assigned to Bhāsa. Further, we find many discrepancies between the *Bṛhatkathā* (as we take it from its copies, the *Kathāsaritsāgara* and *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*) and the two plays. The elephant incident as given in the former is

1 Keith, *SD*, p. 100. 2 Sarup, *HR*, 50, p. 118. 3 *SD*, p. 105. 4 Meerwarth, *JASB*, 1917, p. 270. 5 Keith, *SD*, pp. 102-103; Winternitz, *Problems*, p. 113.

changed in the latter; the *KSS* and *BKM* differentiate between Mahāsena and Pradyota, making Mahāsena the ruler of Avantī and Pradyota the ruler of Magadha, thus striking out Darśaka from the list. The existence of Darśaka has been historically proved.[1] The genealogy of Udayana as given in the *KSS* and the *Purāṇas* differs from that given in the *Pratijñā*. Mr. Ogden opines: "Bhāsa treats the incident in a more realistic and serious fashion than does the light-hearted account of the *KSS* and herein he is probably more faithful to the Udayana legend".[2] Now Udayana, Darśaka, Mahāsena etc. are all known to history and are proved to belong to the 6th or the 5th century B. C. We have already assigned the 4th or the 5th century B. C. to Bhāsa. It seems, therefore, probable that, coming as he does shortly after Udayana, Bhāsa employed the stories about Udayana current in his time.

In an introductory article to his Kannaḍa translation of the *Pratijñā* which has recently been published, Mr. L. Gundappa discusses at length the bearing of the Tamil Perungatai (*Bṛhatkathā*) on the plot of the *Pratijñā*, and tries to show that the story of the play agrees to a greater extent with the version of the Perungatai than with those contained in the Sanskrit descendants of the *Bṛhatkathā*. Another Kannaḍa scholar, Prof. Krishna Sastri, also seems to hold a similar view.[3] The date of Perungatai is not yet settled, but it cannot be earlier than the second century A. D., and hence Bhāsa who flourished centuries before this date, cannot be said to have been indebted to this work for the plot of his *Pratijñā*.

(v) No definite source has been found for the *Cārudatta*. The love of a hetæra for a merchant is a common topic in literature, and hence the story may be taken to be of the poet's invention. Sundarī-Kathā from the *Jātakas* is suggested as the possible source,[4] and it is not unreasonable to suppose that the poet made use of that story as he heard it from oral traditions. That the *Bṛhatkathā* cannot be the source is indicated above.

---

1 Smith, *Oxford History of India*, p. 70; *EHI*, 3rd edition, p. 61; Roy Chaudhari, *PHAI*, 2nd edition, p. 180; Saiśunāga Statues, *JBORS*, Vol.5, 1919; Dec, *JASB*, 1933, pp. 333-337, 342. 2 *JAOS*, 43, p. 169. 3 *Sanskrit Drama*, Bangalore, p. 67. I am indebted Prof. H. L. Hariyappa for this information. He further states that Prof. Krisna Sastri places the Tamil work in the second or third century A. D. while Mr. Gundappa assigns it to the fifth or sixth century A. D. 4 Kirāta, Bhāsa's Works, Marathi translation, pp.115-119.

According to Dr. Sarup, the story of the *Avimāraka* is probably the poet's own creation.[1] Prof. Dhruva assigns it to folklore.[2] Dr. Weller's theory about Avimāraka being the spirit of monsoon who destroys the demon of drought has already been discredited by Dr. Barnett as "highly speculative and supported by no evidence whatever".[3] Dr. Keith states that Bhāsa derived his story from the Kathā literature.[4] Dr. A. Venkatasubbiah compares the stories as given in the *KSS*, *Jayamaṅgalāṭikā* on Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra*, *Jātaka* and the *Nāṭaka*.[5] It appears from that comparison that *Jayamaṅgalā* follows the *Nāṭaka* in giving the same etymology as given in the *Nāṭaka*, in saving the life of the princess, in making Avimāraka the son of Agni, etc. The story of Eḷaka Māraka as given in the *Jātakas* must have been current among the people, and probably Bhāsa also knew it. So, it seems that the story is not invented by the poet. In the light of the data supplied by the *Mṛcch*, it seems to be a plausible inference that Bhāsa extracted the main story from folklore, and added the supernatural element of the ring incident to cater for public taste.

3. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE PLAYS.

i. CHARACTERIZATION. Bhāsa being a realist portrays men and women of this world. His characters do not wear the aspect of fairyland. He does not invest the characters with superhuman, imaginary or inconceivable qualities, and hence the spectators—and also readers for the matter of that—find themselves quite in tune with their psychology and can easily follow and sympathize with them in their ups and downs. The divinities such as Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa, Sītā etc., as also the Rākṣasas and Vānaras such as Rāvaṇa, Vālī, Sugrīva etc., are placed before us with human sentiments and characteristics.

Most of the characters in these plays are psychological studies, and "in psychological subtlety Bhāsa is almost modern".[6] The intricate workings of human emotions are shown by a flash, and no energy is spent unnecessarily for expressing that struggle in the mind of

1 *HB*, 50, p. 118. 2 *Madhyama*, second edition, p.5. 3 Weller, *Avimāraka, Schauspiel von Bhāsa*, Intr.; Barnett, *BSOS*, 3, p. 591. 4 *SD*, p. 101. 5 *IA*, 1931, pp. 113-115. 6 Meerwarth, *JASB*, 1917, p. 278.

the characters. Thus, for example, the self-sacrificing nature of Vāsavadattā is admirably shown and the tragic irony touches our heart in *Svapna*, Act III.

In all these plays, the poet has employed nearly 230 characters, male and female, besides many others that are only mentioned, justifying the remark बहुभूमिकैः (नाटकैः) of Bāṇa. Even with such a large number, every character serves some purpose; not one of them can be dispensed with. The *Bāl* comes with the highest number of characters, and the *Karṇa* has the minimum number. It is a peculiarity of our poet that he paints individuals, not types. Even minor characters, such as chamberlains or maids, are also invested with special individuality distinguishing each of them from similar characters. The characters never talk more or less. They live a plain, straightforward life.

In the *Mahābhārata* plays, we do not get instances of the poet's skill at characterization as he is tied down to the epic for the main features of his characters. Duryodhana and Karṇa are presented here in a favourable light, the poet treating the former almost as a 'Hero'. The *Prat* shows all the characters in a more elevated atmosphere than their portrayal in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. They all wear a human aspect. In Sītā we have an ideal wife, having deep respect for the elders and prepared to follow her Lord cheerfully through thick and thin.

It is when we come to the legendary plays that we get glimpses of the poet's skill at characterization. At his hands, the Vidūṣaka has lost his stereotyped gluttony, and has become a constant companion and a helpmate of the hero. Unlike the co-wives in later plays, both Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī in the *Svapna* are free from the slightest taint of jealousy, and vie with each other in their love for, and sacrifice for the sake of, their husband. Udayana also, though agreeing to marry again, cherishes the sweet memory of his dead wife; and is careful enough not to trouble his second wife by disclosing these painful thoughts. Thus the trio, though ideal, is none the less quite human. Yaugandharāyaṇa is a clever minister, more than a match for his rivals, and ready to give his life for his master. In Avimāraka, we have the character of a young hero who

falls in love at first sight, which is, of course, pure love, and at great risk, he meets his beloved who reciprocates his love. An ideal courtesan, equalling if not surpassing, ladies in their love and devotion to their husbands, is portrayed in the *Cār*.

Judging from Brunetiere's standpoint that drama is nothing but the spectacle of a will striving towards a goal and conscious of the means which it employs, many dramas of our group would be found to stand high.[1] The characters of Bhāsa are not so romantic and imaginative as those of Kālidāsa and Bāṇa, not so poetic and sentimental as those of Bhavabhūti, not so vigorous as those of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa, not so unsteady and fairylike as those of Śrī Harṣa, not so humorous and realistic as those of Śūdraka, where the latter has outshone his master.

ii. STYLE AND DIALOGUES.

The metrical portions of Bhāsa's works are dealt with separately. Prose is said to be the chief factor and the real merit in a poet so far as a dramatic piece is concerned. In Bhāsa, "the sentences are everywhere replete with a wealth of ideas beautifully expressed, which cultured minds will easily appreciate".[2] Bhāsa shows his mastery over prose by employing "short bits of prose highly charming in sense and expression".[3] The language is very simple, natural and touching, alternated with simple figures of speech like simile and metaphor. The verbal flow is unimpeded and limpid.

The date assigned by us to Bhāsa also would confirm the impression these dramas make, that Sanskrit was a spoken language of the time. "The superior excellence of sentences which are not subject to the restrictions of versification is everywhere to be observed in these *Rūpakas*. It really surpasses in grandeur, the style of other works and is incomparable."[4] The next approach to the language of our plays is the Sanskrit used in the epics. Bhāsa's fondness for pithy proverbial phrases will be evident from their large number in each play. *Prasāda*, *Ojas* and *Mādhurya* may be said to be the characteristics of Bhāsa's style. There is a change in

1 Cf. Sarup, *Vision*, Intr., pp. 61-62. 2 G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, p. 27.
3 G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, p. 51. 4 G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, p. 33.

style as befits the occasion and sentiment, as is ordained by the *Nāṭyaśāstra*.[1] "He is terse and sparse in his expression. He tells us more by the things he does not say than by the things he says. He is the master of silence"[2]

Dialogue is a necessary element of the drama, and the above observations necessarily apply to the conversational language of Bhāsa; his dialogues are intensely dramatic.[3] The speeches of the characters are natural, realistic and vigorous. There is nothing of effort, bookishness, unnecessary predominance of figures etc., that characterize the dialogues of later dramatists. The dialogues in the *Svapna*, *Avi* and *Ūru* especially, would bear ample testimony to the poet's power. He is certainly the master of dialogues as well.

Not only that. Verse is successfully employed in dialogue. A verse is occasionally split into pādas or smaller bits and each is taken up by a different character. In spite of the criticisms levelled against this practice that it is mechanical and prosaic, we are inclined to agree with Prof. Devdhar that "for quickness of repartee and dazzling play of dialogues, this device is admirably suited".[4]

iii. RASAS AND ALAṀKĀRAS

Rasa is the soul of poetry. In dramatic literature, a poet cannot ignore it but must possess a minute knowledge of its constituents etc., as the aim of every drama is 'the creation in the mind of the audience of sentiment." The main object of a dramatic work is the evolution of some *rasa* by means of *vibhāvas* and *anubhāvas*. Works on rhetorics give psychological and physiological details and subdivisions of *rasas* etc., with which we are not concerned now.

In our running commentary on each play, we have mentioned the dominant sentiment in it, and have also given some striking instances of the figures of speech employed by the poet. It would appear from it that our poet has a special liking for *Vira*, *Vatsala*, *Hāsya*,

---

1 *Bharata Nāṭya Śāstra*, XVI, 105-109. *Samatā*, *Arthavyakti*, *Kānti* and *Audārya* may be stated as the *Kārya-Guṇas* of Bhāsa. 2 Meerwarth, *JASB*, 1917, p. 273. Cf. अनुल्लेख वचो मौनम् । (*Prat*, II. 17). What wealth of information is supplied by these simple words? 3 Johnston, *IA*, 62, p. 98. 4 *Plays etc.*, p. 65. 5 Keith, *SD*, p. 276.

Adbhuta, *Raudra* and *Karuṇa* Rasas.[1] Bhāsa serves as a good instance to show the futility of the impression of some, that a dramatic piece does not appear at its best unless *Śṛṅgāra* plays a prominent part in it. Only two dramas of Bhāsa have that sentiment to some degree, *viz.* the *Svapna* and *Avi*, but there also the poet does not leave proper bounds. It is love of the highest kind.

As for the different figures of speech, Bhāsa is content only with the simple ones. He employs only *Upamā*, *Utprekṣā*, *Rūpaka*, *Arthāntaranyāsa*, *Anumāna* etc. It is not necessary to give examples, generally each verse exemplifying one or the other of the above *alaṁkāras*.[2]

Kālidāsa takes ideas from Bhāsa, and at times, the figures also, but he presents them in quite a different garb owing to his superior genius. The greatness of Bhāsa in the domain of *alaṁkāra* is attested thus by Kālidāsa who, in imitating our poet shows "his practical appreciation of the merits of the dramatist with whose established fame his nascent genius had to contend" [3]

iv. DESCRIPTIONS OF NATURE etc.

Bhāsa being a close observer of nature, his descriptions are interesting and realistic. He gives diverse details and various facts connected with the phenomenon he wishes to describe. Thus, *e. g.*, sunset is pictured in all its details in the *Svapna*, I. 16;

खगा वासोपेताः सलिलमवगाढो मुनिजनः
प्रदीप्तोऽग्निर्भाति प्रविचरति धूमो मुनिवनम्।
परिभ्रष्टो दूराद् रविरपि च संक्षिप्तकिरणो
रथं व्यावर्त्यासौ प्रविगति बनैरस्तशिखरम्॥

---

1 Anticipating some objections to the inclusion of *Vatsala* as a sentiment, the following quotation from the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* III. 251-254 is given.

स्फुटं चमत्कारितया वत्सलं च रसं विदुः।
स्थायी वत्सलता स्नेहः पुत्राद्यालम्बनं मतम्॥
उद्दीपनानि तच्चेष्टा विद्याशौर्यदयादयः।
आलिङ्गनाङ्गसंस्पर्शशिरश्चुम्बनमीक्षणम्॥
पुलकानन्दबाष्पाद्या अनुभावाः प्रकीर्तिताः।
सञ्चारिणोऽनिष्टशङ्कागर्वौग्र्यादयो मताः॥
पद्मगर्भच्छविर्वर्णो दैवतं लोकमातरः।

2 In a subsequent chapter dealing with each play we have quoted some verses as illustrating some figures. The *subhāṣita* as given in an appendix also serve as instances of many *alaṁkāras* found in every one of the plays. 3 Keith, *SD*, p. 120.

and so is darkness with all its effects in the *Bāl*, I.16; III.19 etc.

Bhāsa paints nature as sympathizing with the feelings of the person that observes it.

Avimāraka, who, being disappointed in love and desperate at the idea of not meeting his beloved again, finds the earth emaciated, the trees consumptive, mountains bewailing and the whole world swooning as it were. Cf. *Avi*, IV. 4:

लोकोऽयं रविपाकनष्टहृदयः संयाति मूर्च्छामिव।

The hot sand troubled him, the heat of the sun made him perspire and the whole earth seemed to him as if it were a whole boiling mass. Cf. *Avi*, IV. 5:

आदित्यपाकचलितः फलतीव लोकः।

Earlier, when Avimāraka was in optimistic moods, thinking about the variety of human nature, he found the earth also putting on a different garb at night fall. Cf. *Avi*, II. 13:

वेषान्तरं रचयतीव मनुष्यलोकः।

The whole stanza beautifully describes the approach of night.

A Vidyādhara couple was viewing the same earth at the same time when it appeared to be swooning and boiling to Avimāraka. They observed it from above and as they were in a joyous mood, the earth presented quite a different aspect to them. Cf. *Avi*, IV. 11:

शैलेन्द्राः कलभोपमा जलधयः क्रीडातटाकोपमा
वृक्षाः शैवलसन्निभाः क्षितितलं प्रच्छन्ननिम्नस्थलम्।
सीमन्ता इव निम्नगाः सुविपुलाः सौधाश्च बिन्दूपमा
दृष्टं वक्रमिवाभिभाति सकलं संक्षिप्तरूपं जगत्॥

As they were high up in the air, everything appeared so small that they thought that the world was as it were epitomized. Cf. *Avi*, IV. 11 d: दृष्टं वक्रमिवाभिभाति सकलं संक्षिप्तरूपं जगत् and when the couple was coming down, the earth appeared to them as if running with the encircling ocean. Cf. *Avi*, 12 d:

अभिपततीव मही समुद्रमुद्रा।

Later on, after meeting his beloved, the thundering clouds, terrifying lightening and heavy showers of rain which

greatly upset his beloved suggest only similes of love and amorous sport to Avimāraka. Cf. *Avi*, V. 7 d:

प्राप्तोऽप्रयौवनघनस्तनमर्दकालः ।

Thus nature responds to the feelings of the beholder. The descriptions of nature are accurate and appropriate.

To Bharata on his way to Ayodhyā in a chariot, on account of the high speed the trees appeared as if running with the chariot, the dust in the spokes looking like the waters of a river passing through them, etc.—a very realistic description, barring of course the improbability of Bharata seeing the wheels or spokes while seated in the chariot. Cf. *Prat*, III. 2:

द्रुमा धावन्तीव द्रुतरथगतिक्षीणविषया
नदीवोद्वृत्ताम्बुर्निपतति मही नेमिविवरे ।
अरण्यक्लिन्नेष्टा स्थितमिव जवाच्चक्रवलयं
रजश्चाधोद्भूतं पतति पुरतो नानुपतति ॥

The poet has also interspersed many similes and metaphors concerning the natural phenomena in a number of verses. The similes and poetic imageries are not only apt but being suitable to the context, increase its beauty. We get descriptions of the ocean, or similes about it only in the *Abh*. Cf. *Abh*, IV. 3, 17:

क्वचिद् फेनोद्गारी क्वचिदपि च मीनाकुलजलः
क्वचिच्छंखाकीर्णः क्वचिदपि च नीलाम्बुदनिभः ।
क्वचिद् वीचीमालः क्वचिदपि च नक्रप्रतिभयः
क्वचिद् भीमावर्तः क्वचिदपि च निष्कम्पसलिलः ॥

gives a beautiful description of the ocean, calm here ruffled there, as it stood parted affording a passage for Rāma.

Besides descriptions of nature, our poet has shown his mastery in giving vivid, accurate, realistic accounts of battle. Such are those, *e. g.* in the *Abh* (VI. 1-18) and *Ūru* (vv. 16-26) describing the fights between Rāma and Rāvaṇa, and Bhīma and Duryodhana respectively.

Mention may also be made of the description of the sacrifice and sacrificial fire in the first act of the *Pañc*, and of the sacerdotal similes that are found in many places, *e. g.* in the *Ūru* (vv. 4-14) there is a perfect comparison between the battle-field and sacrifice. Cf. *Ūru*, v. 6:

करिवरकरयूपो बाणविन्यस्तदर्भो
हतगजचयनोत्थो वैरवह्निप्रदीप्तः ।
ध्वजवितनविमानः सिंहनादोच्चमन्त्रः
पतितपशुमनुष्यः संस्थितो युद्धयज्ञः ॥

Hanuman in the *Abh* supplies us with a description of Laṅkā with its palaces, pleasure gardens etc.(*Abh*, pp. 21-24).

The description of night and darkness seems to be a favourite one with our poet as it occurs in the *Avi* (pp. 43-46), *Cār* (pp. 25-26) and *Bāl* (pp. 7, 9). In all these places, effects of darkness are artistically depicted.

All these descriptions pronounce Bhāsa to be a realist, pure and simple; he does not go beyond enumeration of the facts constituting the particular scenes, places or action; no flights of imagination are to be met with in Bhāsa. His sense of tact is much stronger than his imagination. This peculiarity of Bhāsa will be evident when we compare Bhāsa's descriptions with similar ones from Kālidāsa, Harṣa, etc.

v. NĀNDI.

MSS of Sanskrit dramas present two different styles in their opening portions. Most of the dramas begin with a benedictory stanza called Nāndī followed by the stage direction नान्द्यन्ते ततः प्रविशति सूत्रधारः । But in Bhāsa's works as well as a number of South Indian plays including the Southern MSS of the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, *Vikramorvaśīya*, etc. the stage direction *nāndyante* etc. precedes the benedictory stanza, generally known as *Nāndi*. In the latter case, some different meaning for '*Nāndī*' other than 'a benedictory verse' will have to be sought; otherwise the whole thing would amount to this: after the performance of *Nāndī* the Sūtradhāra enters the stage and again recites *Nāndī* (the benedictory stanza). This is meaningless. Viśvanātha, as we have seen, has noticed this difference in the MSS, and Śāradātanaya has tried to get over the seeming difficulty.[1] According to him, in the first case, where the stage direction *Nāndyante* etc. comes after the benedictory stanza, the word *nāndyante* is to be taken as *Tatpuruṣa*—"After finishing the Nāndī (नान्द्याः अन्तः)", while

1 *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, p. 63 (Kane's edition); *Bhāvaprakāśana*, GOS No. 40, p. 200, also Intr., pp. 45-46.

in the latter case, the expression *nāndyante* is to be taken as *Bahuvrihi* (नान्दी अन्तः यस्य स नान्द्यन्तः) meaning "After finishing the preliminaries (of which *Nāndī* is the last act.") Thus, "Sūtradhāra reciting *Nāndī* after the stage direction *nāndyante* etc. after finishing preliminaries (of which *Nāndī* is the concluding function)" appears quite appropriate. In this connection, it may be noted that Prof. Pisharoti's explanation of *Nāndī* as a long process of religious ceremony conducted in the green-room and on the stage behind the curtain, is more suitable than Dr. Sarup's "flourish of trumpets."[1]

On the strength of the testimony of Bāṇa about Bhāsa's dramas being सूत्रधारकृतारम्भ, much capital has been made of this peculiar mode of opening in the Bhāsa dramas, taking it to refer only to this particular mode which these dramas share with a number of other Southern MSS and South Indian plays. The arguments are not strong enough to convince one as to this mode being a speciality of Bhāsa. It may be an old practice of MSS which has been preserved in Bhāsa and the Southern manuscripts, while the usual opening is frequently due to a remodelling under the influence of 'kaścit' referred to by Viśvanātha.[2] Probably, as already stated, Bāṇa simply wanted to tell about the general characteristic of Bhāsa's works comparing them with temples. There is also a possibility that Bāṇa may have referred to some stage reform of Bhāsa; but at present no case has been made out for such an assumption.[3]

The information given by Prof. Pisharoti throws some doubt as to the authenticity of some of these so-called benedictory verses to our plays, especially those employing the *Mudrālaṁkāra*, as would appear from the introductory

1 Pisharoti, *BSOS*, 6, p. 820; Sarup, *Vision*, Trans., p. 1. 2 Cf. Konow, *IA*, 49, p. 234. 3 We have consulted all the articles on the subject that we came across and our considered opinion is as stated above; among others we referred to Asuri, (*SB*, 5, p. 13); Banerji Sastri (*JBRS*, 1921, pp. 368-370); Barnett (*JBRS*, 1921, pp. 587-588); Devdhar, (*Plays etc.*, pp. 42-44); G. Sastri (*Critical Study*, pp. 17-18, 94, 121); Hiramanda Sastri (*MASI*, 28, pp. 4-6); Khuperkar, (*Lokasiksana*, 5, pp. 325-329); Keith (*BSOS*, 3, p. 297); Konow (*ID*, p. 25; *IA*, 49, p. 234); Lindenau (*BS*, pp. 1, 37); Paranjape (*Pratimā*, Intr., pp. XII-XIV); A. K. Pisharoti (*Criticism*, pp. 8-12); K. R. Pisharoti (*Shama'a*, 1924, pp. 141-142 n1; 1925, pp. 181-184; *AUJ*, 3, p. 150; *BSOS*, 3, p. 113 n3; 6, pp. 819-821; *Bāl*, Trans., reprint, *QJMS*, p. 1, n1); Raja, (*ZII*, 2, pp. 252-255; *JOR*, 1, pp. 227-230); Ramaswami Sastri, (*Bhāvaprakāśana*, *GOS*, Intr., pp. 45-47); Sarup, (*Vision*, Intr., pp. 20-21); Shivadatta Sarma (*NPP*, 4, p. 142); Venkatarama Sarma (*IHQ*, 5, pp. 725-726); Winternitz, (*Problems*, pp. 127-128); Woolner and Sarup (*Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, 1, p. IX note).

verses to some acts of the *Svapna*, *Pratijñā* and *Dgh.*[1] The non-mention of the names of the poet and the work in the prologues of the plays as we have them today was not to be seen in Bāṇa's days as would appear from the latter's statement; this would have been a singularly distinctive characteristic of Bhāsa, and hence it seems that there has been some mangling with the prologues to some extent. But we cannot concede more than this. The other portions are certainly by Bhāsa as we have seen in the case of the *Svapna*. So, this '*Nāndī*' business cannot be taken to indicate the Southern origin or the Cākyār authorship of these Bhāsa plays.

vi. BHARATAVĀKYAS.

MM. Dr. Ganapati Sastri speaks with reference to the *Bharatavākyas* that they do not refer to any particular king but "only speak of one's own king in general."[2] We do not take Rājasiṁha as the proper name of the king, but to us the change in the toning of the *Bharatavākyas* in different plays seems to refer undoubtedly to the vicissitudes in the life of some particular king. The prayers परचक्रं प्रशाम्यतु and लक्ष्म्या समायुक्तो, राजा भूमिं प्रशास्तु नः tell in clear unmistakable terms of foreign invasion and possibly of the king's losing, regaining and expanding his kingdom during the period these plays were written. The prayer would be meaningless unless there were these obstacles of inland and foreign invasions and hence we are inclined to take these *Bharatavākyas* to refer to historical facts. The extent of the kingdom is given as "bounded by Vindhya and Himalayas and the oceans".

Now we shall briefly state the views as to the identity of Rājasiṁha put forth by different scholars and try to meet their arguments. Beginning from the lower limit, the views of Dr. Barnett and Prof. Pisharoti identifying him with some Pāṇḍya or Pallava king are obviously untenable, since the dramas are written much earlier, the boundaries of Bhāsa do not tally and the evidence is not supported by history.[3] The dramas,

---

1 *BSOS*, 6, pp. 820-821; *AUJ*, 3, pp. 150-151; *Shama'a*, 1924, pp. 141-142. 2 *Critical Study*, pp. 93-94; also cf. Winternitz, *CR*, Decr. 1924, p. 344; Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 140. 3 Barnett, *JRAS*, 1919, p. 233 (Pāṇḍya Ter. Maran Rājasiṁha); Hirananda Sastri, *MASI*, 28, p. 25 (Two Pallava chiefs, namely Siṁha-Viṣṇu and Narasiṁhavarman Rājasiṁha I); Kane *VJV*, 1920, p. 99 (Pāṇḍya Rājasiṁha); Kavi, *JAHRS*, 2, p. 143 (Pallava Rājasiṁha I or Siṁha-

further, proceed from the North. Dr. Sten Konow would find in Rājasiṁha a reference to a Kṣatrapa king, by placing Śūdraka in the third century A. D., and assuming that the word Rājasiṁha refers to Rudrasiṁha I.[1] But, "two weak arguments combined do not make a strong argument".[2] No special reason is shown why 'Rājasiṁha' should refer to the particularly selected king, there being among the Western kṣatrapas three kings of the name Rudrasiṁha, one Siṁhasena and one Viśvasiṁha, who all ruled between 180 and 388 A.D. The territorial boundaries also do not coincide. Dr. K. P. Jayaswal and Mr. P. Chaudhury come next, championing the cause of Nārāyaṇa Kāṇva.[3] But "the theory seems more ingenious than probable" as the interpretations and allusions in 'Nārāyaṇa,' "Bārhadrathāpahṛta' and 'Upendra' etc. are far-fetched, unwarranted and ill-suited to the context. The descriptions further "would better suit the Śunga king."[4] The attempt is said to have been made "with more imagination than historical facts".[5] No case is made out for foreign invasion. It militates against the vicissitudes of the king, and is not borne out by historical material. Prof. Dhruva next deserves our attention by making Bhāsa the court poet of Puṣyamitra, and referring the '*paracakra*' to the invasion by Menander.[6] In addition to the ignorance of the South that our poet displays for so late a period, there are historical facts that do not lend their support to this theory. Prof. Dhruva finds allusions to the invasion and conquest of Magadha under Puṣyamitra by Khāravela and Menander, Puṣyamitra's subsequent victory and performance of the *Aśvamedha*, in the *Bharatavākyas*. But all this is wrong. It is shown by Dr. Roy Chaudhury that Khāravela cannot be the comtemporary of Puṣyamitra, and 'Menander could not have been the Indo-Greek contemporary of Puṣyamitra Śunga".[7] Thus the contemporaneity of Puṣyamitra, Khāravela and Menander is open to much doubt. Internal evidence, again, will go against any such identity; for, there is much change in

---

Visnu); Raddi, *VJV*, 47, p. 185 (Kerala Rājasiṁha); Saraswati, *IHQ*.1, pp. 263-264 (Pallava Rājasiṁha).

1 *ID*, p. 51. 2 Winternitz, *Problems*, p. 124. 3 Jayaswal, *JASB*, 1913, pp. 264-265; Chaudhuri, *MR*, Oct. 1913, pp. 384-387. 4 Venkataraman *MR*, 1914, p. 598. 5 Winternitz, *CR*, Dec. 1924, p. 343. 6 *Svapnavā Sundarī*, pp. 11-12, 30-59. 7 *PHAI*, pp. 237-249, on p. 249.

the sociological conditions of the Śunga period and of the period of these plays.

Then remain two claimants to the title 'Rājasiṁha', viz., Candragupta and Nanda. The reign of Candragupta would suit the description of the *Bharatavākyas*;[1] but from the fact of the Kauṭilīya *Arthaśāstra* containing a quotation from Bhāsa, we are inclined to place Bhāsa as the senior contemporary of Kauṭilya, and hence of Candragupta. The reign of Mahāpadma also answers the territorial limits as he was the first to bring the whole of Northern India under his sovereignty. The choice, therefore, remains to be made between Mahāpadma and Candragupta and we would vote in favour of the former.[2] Thus, Bhāsa was the court poet of Ugrasena Mahāpadma, as the description of the *Bharatavākyas* suits him and the sociological conditions depicted in these plays fit in very well with the Mauryan epoch.

vii. ANACHRONISMS.

Late date was assigned to these plays on account of the mention of statue-houses and *Nyāyaśāstra* of Medhātithi in the *Prat*, deification of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa in the *Abh* and *Bāl*, mention of Kharapaṭa in the *Cār*, naming of a Brāhmaṇa as Keśavadāsa in the *Mv*, and the use of metronyms in some of the plays.[3] All of these can be shown not to be real anachronisms.

i. We have already shown that there is historical evidence for the existence of statue-houses since very long in India, and that the so-called South Indian statue-houses are quite different from those mentioned in the *Prat*.[4] There is no sense in identifying Medhātithi's

---

1 Contra, Dhruva, *Svapnavāsavadatta*, Intr., p. 12. But Candragupta had to contend with Seleucus Nicator. There is further, a close correspondence between the sociological conditions as depicted by Bhāsa and those of the Mauryan period. The famous Greek invasion led by Alexander, the Great, took place in the reign of Ugrasena Mahāpadma, who was "the sole king," ruling the whole earth under one umbrella, (*MR*, Octr. 1930, p. 438). It cannot be said that Bhāsa could not have praised a Śūdra king (*Mṛcch*, Ed. by Mehta and Dave, Intr., p. VI) since the divine origin of kings (नो विष्णुः पृथिवीपतिः) is an ancient Indian dictum. 2 For Mahāpadma's history, Cf. Smith, *EHI*, p. 51; Rapson, *CHI*, pp. 313-314; Roy Chaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, 1927, pp. 140-145. Bhāsa's works show slight priority to Candragupta, and Kauṭilya quotes from Bhāsa, hence our preference for Ugrasena Mahāpadma. 3 Cf. Pisharoti, *BSOS*, 3, p. 108 n2; Winternitz, *Problems*, p. 123; Kane, *VJV*, 1920, pp. 100-102; Devdhar, *Plays etc.* pp. 36-37; Sankar, *AMV*, 2, pp. 56, 62-64. 4 Chapter II Supra. Cf. G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, pp. 99-100; *BSOS*, 3, pp. 629-630; Haraprasad Sastri, *OC*, V, pp. 97-98; Jayaswal, *JBORS*, 5, pp. 98-99.

Nyāyaśāstra with *Manubhāṣya*; even some of the antagonists have taken Medhātithi to be Medhātithi Gautama.[1] Further, we do not find any instance of such glaring anachronisms in Bhāsa.

ii. As for the deification of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, it has not been conclusively shown that Rāma and Kṛṣṇa were not regarded as manifestations of Viṣṇu before the first or the second century B. C. That Kṛṣṇa was worshipped in the fourth century B. C. would be evident from the fragments of the *Indika* of Megasthenes.[2] The deification must have been a slow process and we feel certain that it was long before the 6th century B. C. that Kṛṣṇa was deified. The case of Rāma is also similar and there is nothing to contradict the conjecture that they were deified before Bhāsa's time, or at any rate, by Bhāsa.

iii. 'Kharapaṭa' as an author of the science of thieving is known since the time of the *Arthaśāstra* and it is more reasonable to suppose that the *Mattavilāsa* copied the tradition from the *Arthaśāstra* or the *Cārudatta* than to assume the reverse, in face of the priority of the *Arthaśāstra* at least. At any rate, the tradition making Kharapaṭa the guardian deity of thieves is a fairly old one, not inconsistent with the date we have assigned to Bhāsa.[3]

iv. With regard to the rule of Manu that the name of a Brāhamaṇa should end in śarman (*Manu*, II. 32 शर्मवद् ब्राह्मणस्य स्यात्), it is not shown that this was an ancient rule invariably followed. Further, it is inconceivable that our poet, a strong upholder of orthodox Brahmanism as he is, would ignore such a directory rule especially as he seems to be so particular in the very same play, in such minute details as to the particular form 'भोः' to be used in addressing Brāhmaṇas. Contravention of the rule of Manu does not necessarily mean posteriority to Manu.

v. The use of metronyms does not put a work to a late date. In fact it is an old practice found in ancient *Sūtra* works and *Upaniṣads*.

It is said that the use of the words Svāmin,

---

1 Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, p. 55 n90. 2 Macdonell, *HSL*, p. 411. Cf. also Bhandarkar, *EI*, 1934, pp. 196-205. Hathi-Bada inscription refers to the temple of Saṅkarṣaṇa and grants for its upkeep in the second century A. D. 3 *Arthaśāstra*, IV. 8, p. 221; cf. also G. Harihar Sastri, *AMV*, I. pp. 294-427.

Bhartṛdāraka, Bhadramukha, etc. in the terminology of Sanskrit dramaturgy is due to the influence of the Kṣatrapas as is evident from their inscriptions;[1] and as Bhāsa employs those expressions in his works dealing with the incidents of the earlier period, this would be an instance of an anachronism. We think with Prof. Kane, that the Kṣatrapas were not the originators, but "that the inscription was composed by one who was thoroughly imbued with the dramatic terminology contained in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*".[2] Hence this also does not necessarily prove to be an anachronism.

Thus the so-called anachronisms are non-existent. We could not come across any instance that could be included in the list, and hence it seems to us that Bhāsa is free from the defect of anachronism.

viii. DEFECTS.

The praise that has been showered on Bhāsa should not make us oblivious of his defects. Nothing is perfect in this world of human beings and Bhāsa is no exception to this rule. It should, however, be borne in mind that Bhāsa's works are the first specimens of Sanskrit drama and hence we should not expect them to be the finished products of a tried hand, being the works of a pioneer Sanskrit dramatist. Again we have to take into account the popular beliefs in those days as to the use of magic etc., which may not be appreciated by the present day critics.

The first drawback that would strike one after a study of these works is that the poet ignores the unity of time. In the *Bāl* towards the close of the first act when Vasudeva delivers Kṛṣṇa to the care of Nandagopa, night is said to have ended (p. 18—प्रभाता रजनी।) and Vasudeva sets out to go back to Mathurā; but on his arrival there, he finds Mathurā under the spell of night (p. 20 तथैव प्रसुप्तो मथुरायां सर्वो जनः।).

In the beginning of the third act of the *Avi*, the moon is said to have risen (p. 42 गदप्पाओ पओसो। आरुन्दा जोण्हा।); but after a time when the hero starts on his mission, he finds darkness everywhere (p. 43).

During the course of the conversation in the first

1 *LAvi*, *IA*, 33, p. 163. 2 *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, Intr., pp. VII-IX.

act of the *Svapna* the time is indicated to be the mid-day (p. 24 स्थितो मध्याह्नः), while towards the close of it, after a lapse of half an hour or so, the sun is said to have set (p. 37, Act 1. 16).

The fourth act of the *Avi* also has got some contradictory statements about the lapse of time. Avimāraka after leaving the Kanyāntaḥpura, says that he has been wandering for a number of days (p. 58) but his friend Santuṣṭa whom he meets the same day, in his soliloquy says that he was told of Avimāraka's flight that very day (p. 69).

Small one-act plays, however, are quite perfect in observing the unity of time, the time of their action being that required for the actual representation on the stage of the play.

The *tithi* scheme of the *Cār* is faulty, being repugnant to the unity of time, while the *Mṛcch* has improved it.[1]

Many Sanskrit dramatists of quite late times are found to violate the rule as to the unity of time and hence Bhāsa may be said to be in good company.

Another defect of the same kind, which is peculiar to Bhāsa alone is found in the use of निष्क्रम्य प्रविश्य. The chamberlains, door-keepers, messengers etc. are sent out either to bring some characters or some news; they start out and return immediately with the person called or with the news of events which must have taken long to happen. This tells very heavily on the sense of time and proportion as well as the credulity of the spectators and appears quite unnatural.

Similarly the poet uses the device of *Ākāśabhāṣita* by which a person is represented as speaking with some one not on the stage and himself repeating what the latter says, or replies to him with the words किं ब्रवीषि etc. Though this minimizes the number of characters it takes the elements of reality and naturalness out of the dramatic piece, the spectators requiring some strain of imagination. The method is not impressive, though of practical utility from the point of stage economy, as it saves a number of characters.

---

1 Sukthankar, *JAOS*, 42, pp. 70, 73-74; Paranjape, *Sāhitya Saṅgraha*, I, pp. 103-127.

The audience receives another blow to its imagination when some characters appear on the stage quite unannounced, without any intimation, in contravention of the specific dictum: **असूचितस्य पात्रस्य प्रवेशो नोपपद्यते ।**

Grammatical solecisms, faults in versifications, use of such *pādapūraṇas* as **तु, वै, च, वा** etc. very often, some verses being quite plain and devoid of sentiments or poetic fancy, are some of the minor defects of Bhāsa. Some of the former in the above may be justified on the ground of epic usage and influence, and possibly they were not looked as defects in those days.

4. PERSONAL HISTORY OF BHĀSA.

In this age when every one tries to blow his own trumpet and widest publicity is sought for any third-rate composition and the particulars about the name etc. of the author are given, it seems rather strange that the renowned author of this precious treasure should keep such merciless reticence about himself, as not to mention even his name![1] We had to depend on inference for attributing the works to Bhāsa; and the information about Bhāsa as given below is nothing more than our impressions about the author after a close study of his works.

Prof. Dhruva says that there was a tradition to mention the name of one's *gotra*, and it is in accordance with this, that we get such names as Patañjali, Yaugandharāyaṇa. *Bhāṣa* is a *gotra* in Haimodaka division of Agastya *gotra* and Bhāsa is the corrupt form.[2] That he was a Brāhmaṇa, an orthodox follower of the caste-system and a firm believer in the practice, utility and efficacy of sacrifices etc., seems to follow from the views he takes of these things. We have already shown that Dhāvaka is quite a distinct person from our author and hence it follows that the description of the latter as a 'washerman' by caste, on the strength of the alleged identity is not correct.[3] There is no internal evidence to support the inference.

---

1 Cf. Paranjape, *Sāhitya Sangraha*, 1, pp. 18-32, at p. 27. The whole chapter is a beautiful piece, a striking instance of Gadya Kāvya in which the celebrated Marathi writer specialised. One is tempted to find autobiographical references in the chapter. 2 Dhruva, *Svapnani Sundari*, Intr., p. 14. 3 Supra, Chapter II; Cf. Narayana Sastri, *Priyadarsikā*, Intr., pp. XXI-XXIV.

Mr. Sankar takes Bhāsa to have been the ruling king on account of the use of त्वाम् ("may Balarāma protect *thee* etc."), and श्रीमान्नारायणस्ते, ("may Nārāyaṇa award *thee* the entire earth") in the benedictory stanzas of the *Svapna* and *Avi*. The benedictions, according to him, refer to the royal author himself, otherwise "the plural should have been used if they were meant for the audience".[1] It would be more reasonable, we think, to suppose that the poet used त्वाम् or ते purposely in these two dramas only, as he was sure of the king's presence at the first performance of the dramas. This explains the absence of such words from the benedictory stanzas in the *Pratijñā*, *Pañc*, *Prat*, as the poet was not sure whether the king would grace the occasion by his attendance. The prayer in the remaining benedictory stanzas is for the protection of the audience, viz. वः ("of you all"). This fact, coupled with the epilogues of the dramas, seems to suggest that Bhāsa was a court poet of some king, rather than the king himself. The absence of the benedictory stanza and the epilogue to the *Cār* shows that the poet could not give final touches to the same, owing perhaps to his death.

His ignorance of the South and mention of countries, towns, rivers and specialities (e. g. *tālipatra* in the *Cār*, p. 82) of the North proclaim the poet to be a northerner; the characters of his plays are from the North and the scenes in almost all the plays lie in Northern India. So it seems to be a more reasonable assumption to take the poet to be an inhabitant of the North than to have him as a Southerner.[2]

The benedictory stanzas as well as the introductory verses and the general tone of the plays show that Bhāsa was a Vaiṣṇava of the Bhakti cult. He also knew the Pañcarātra system of philosophy. He was a champion of the Brāhmaṇas, a staunch upholder of the caste-system and a firm believer in the efficacy of the sacrificial oblations. He seems to be well-versed in all the *Śāstras* and conversant with all the conventionalities of behaviour according to the orthodox systems. Truth in thought, word and deed was his motto. He seems to have been an obedient and dutiful

---

1 *AMV*, 2, p. 61. 2 As taken by all the Anti-Bhāsaites. Dr. Keith and Weller also suggest likewise. Cf. *SD*, p. 105.

son, full of respect for the elders, a born conversationalist holding the assembly spell-bound, humorous and witty by nature, and modest. He was a minute observer of nature and humanity. A loyal and patriotic subject of the king, he was never a slavish flatterer, and his self-respect brooked no insult or indignity from his master. His message of optimism shows that Bhāsa probably lived in peaceful and affluent circumstances. He voices forth the general disregard towards the Jain and Buddhist monks and nuns. He was also well-read in various aspects of politics and knew a good deal about art, painting and sculpture. Being connected with the court-life, he was quite aware of the plots and counterplots daily hatched within the four walls of the palaces.

Bhāsa is reputed to have written a work on the *Nāṭyaśāstra*;[1] and the fact of his dramas being found admirably suited for the stage has led Kirāta to hazard the inference that the poet may have been connected with professional actors in his early life.[2] Dr. Keith tells us that actors used to go from town to town even in Buddha's time.[3] So Kirāta's guess may be correct.

5. OTHER WORKS OF BHĀSA.

Years before the present works appeared before the public Mr. S. Narayana Sastrigal in his introduction to the *Ratnāvali* had stated that *Kiraṇāvali*, *Mukuṭatāḍitaka* and *Udāttarāghava* from amongst the Bhāsa dramas were to be found in a private library and that in the prologue to the last-named of these, Bhāsa had mentioned himself as the author of twenty-three dramatic compositions.[4] Mr. Krishnamacharya doubted the authority of these statements, and as none of the above works have come forth as yet, the doubts seem to have been confirmed. Mr. K. Sampathagiri Rao also notes the tradition that "Bhāsa wrote thirty plays and more".[5]

Mr. Narayana Sastri in the same connection ascribes the *Ghaṭakarpara Kāvya* to Bhāsa, after attempting to prove the identity of Bhāsa, Dhāvaka and Ghaṭakarpara on the authority of *Kāvyānuśāsana* of Hemacandra which is not yet out.[6] This authority also is

1 Keith, *SD*, p. 105; Sarup, *Vision*, Intr., p. 37. 2 Marathi translation, Intr., p. 151. 3 *SD*, pp. 43–44. 4 Cf. Krishnamacharya, *Priyadarśikā*, *Bhāmtikā*, pp. XXI–XXXI. 5 *ADC*, p. 131. 6 Cf. Krishnamacharya, *op. cit.* pp. XXII-XXIII.

not trustworthy, as said by Krishnamacharya. Now, one *Ghaṭakarpara Kāvya* by Ghaṭakarpara Kavi has been published by the Venkateshwar Press, and it must be the same work as referred to by Narayana Sastri, since the last verse आलम्ब्य चाम्बु etc. as quoted by the learned Sastri occurs in the book as No. 22, and हंसपंक्तिरपि नाथ etc., alleged to be quoted in the *Kāvyānuśāsana*, also finds its place as No. 9 in the book. But this *Ghaṭakarpara Kāvya* does not appear to be the work of Bhāsa, the author of our plays. The identity between him and Ghaṭakarpara is yet to be established as the argument rests on very flimsy grounds. Further, even if the same be proved, we shall have to take him as another Bhāsa , since the matter and manner of the book are strongly against the authorship of Bhāsa, the writer of our plays. It is full of *Śabdālaṁkāras* and *Yamakas*, end and middle rhymes,—and it will be readily accepted that Bhāsa is quite innocent of such devices. With Bhāsa the tendency to use alliteration, rhyming, and other figures of words is the exception rather than the rule. The similes and metaphors from the sphere of *Śṛṅgāra* employed in the Kāvya are of such a nature as to preclude the possibility of their having ever been composed by Bhāsa. Too much attention towards the outer form and word-jugglery were the characteristics of the later age and hence the *Ghaṭakarpara* cannot be ascribed to our Bhāsa. It will be noted, further, that none of the verses praising Bhāsa mention *Yamaka* as his characteristic.

Mr. Guleri pointed out the existence of "A poem by Bhāsa", its name being विष्णुधर्म (plural).[1] This has been inferred from a verse in the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya* by Jayānaka (12th century A. D.)

सत्काव्यसंदारविधौ खलानां
दीक्षानि बद्धेरपि मानसानि ।
भासस्य काव्यं खलु विष्णुधर्मान् (?)
सोऽप्याननात्पारतवन्मुमोच ॥

Jonarāja (15th century A. D.), while commenting on the verse, refers, *inter alia*, to the competition between Bhāsa and Vyāsa and the fire-ordeal, incidentally mentioning Bhāsa as Bhāsa Muni . Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri proposed an emendation by reading विष्णुधर्मन् for

1 *IA*, 42, pp. 52-53.

विष्णुधर्मान्, took the word as an epithet of 'Fire'—'औत्पत्तिकदाहकस्वभाववान्'—and by the insertion of तपोमेध्यान् in the third line, rendered the verse as meaning "Fire left unburnt the poems of Bhāsa like mercury"; while the reading, as it stood, meant, according to Dr. Sastri, "Fire did not burn those portions of both Bhāsa and Vyāsa which described Viṣṇudharma".[1] He, however, concludes that the exact meaning is to be got at by having other manuscripts of the original and the commentary.

We think that the word विष्णुधर्मान् in the quotation does not refer to any works of Bhāsa, but the whole verse is meant to state the tradition of Bhāsa's works having survived the fire ordeal. Mr. Sankar successfully tries to extract the required confirmation of the tradition from the verse by emending विष्णुधर्मान् to विष्णुधर्मन्, and पारतवत् to भारतवत्. He takes the verse to mean that the *Svapnavāsavadatta* in Bhāsa's works equals Bhārata in merits.[2] There is thus no necessity to suppose the transference of the tradition of the *Svapna* as done by Dr. Bhandarkar,[3] because the verse confirms the tradition and is not at variance with it. That really seems to be the sense. Hence the attempts to identify the *Viṣṇudharma* with some published or unpublished works seem to us rather futile and baseless.[4]

Mr. R. Kavi of Rajahmundry in a paper read at the Third Oriental Conference held at Madras, attributed the *Dāmaka Prahasanam* and *Traivikrama* to Bhāsa.[5] Dr. Jolly in a learned article in *Festgabe Garbe* has disproved the alleged connection in the case of *Dāmaka Prahasana*, and Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti, one of the leaders of the opposition, places the *Traivikrama* in the 12th century A.D., and ascribes it to some Cākyār, possibly Nīlakaṇṭha.[6]

Dāmaka Prahasana would serve as the best illustration of what may be called a 'compilation'. Traces of borrowing from different sources are evident in many parts of the work. Thus, the first scene has been patched

---

1 *Critical Study*, pp. 48-49; App. II b. 2 *AMV*, 2, pp. 42-43. 3 *IA*, 42, p. 53 note. 4 Bhandarkar *(op. cit)* refers to two works of the name of *Viṣṇudharma* or *Viṣṇudharmottara*, both *Purāṇas*. Hirananda Sastri (*MASI*, 28, p. 27) identifies the *Viṣṇudharma* of Bhāsa with *Viṣṇudharmottarīya* published at Bombay. One *Viṣṇudharmottara*, containing one of the oldest and most exhaustive treatises on Indian painting has been published by Dr. Stella Kramrisch, Calcutta, 1928. 5 *OC*, III, pp. 80-85. 6 Jolly, *Festgabe Garbe*, pp. 115-121; Pisharoti, *Shama'a*, 1924, pp. 213-222 at p. 214; *Dāmaka*, edited by V. Sarma, Lahore, 1926.

up by passages bodily taken from the *Karṇa*, *Svapna*, *Avi* and *Mattavilāsa*. The name Dāmaka appears in the *Bāl*, and the confusion between Brahmadatta and Kāmpilya is taken from the *Svapna* and *Avi*. The description of Āśrama shows borrowing from the *Svapna*, and the reference to दुष्कुरु is from the *Mattavilāsa*. The story of Karṇa and Paraśurāma is identical with that in the *Karṇa*, and so is the *Bharatavākya*. The *maṅgala* stanza has been incorporated from the *Arthaśāstra*.[1] Mr. R. Kavi could not venture an opinion about the portions borrowed from the *Mattavilāsa*, and yet he concluded that this work must take the seat in the thirteen works! *Dāmaka* may have been the compilation of a single 'lucky' Cākyār, but the mass of evidence given above speaks conclusively against its being an original composition. We concur with Dr. Jolly in assigning it to Cākyār workmanship after the seventh century A.D.

By no stretch of imagination are we able to ascribe the term 'drama' to *Traivikrama*. "It is but an apology. There is no plot, no construction, no characterization in the dramatic form".[2] It is no doubt unique in that there is no prologue, the stage manager enters with his mistress, and there are no characters besides these two. It is only a dialogue about Vāmanāvatāra in which the Sūtradhāra narrates the events in verse, while the Naṭī's task is only to say तदो तदो at intervals. The later limit for the date of the *Traivikrama* has been supplied by the *Śākuntalacarcanā*, which has been placed in the fourteenth century. The play itself speaks of its date as twelfth century. So its ascription to Bhāsa, or to any other dramatist prior to the twelfth century, is quite impossible. Prof. Pisharoti is right in fathering it on some Cākyār, preferably Nīlakaṇṭha.

Mr. Sankar ascribes to Bhāsa in addition to the *Svapna*, *Pratijñā*, *Abh*, *Pañc*, *Dv*, *Bāl* and *Avi*, the authorship of the *Padmaprābhṛtaka* and *Mṛcch*.[3] His identification of Bhāsa with Śūdraka does not seem to be based on conclusive grounds. '*Vatsarājacarita*' may be the scribe's alternative title for the *Pratijñā*; this cannot

1 *Arthaśāstra*, XIV, 3, p. 421:

सुवर्णपुष्पीं पृथ्वीं पर्याप्तां पत्नीमिव कुलस्त्रियम्।
सर्वांश्च देवता वन्दे वन्दे सर्वांश्च तापसान्॥

2 Pisharoti, *Bhasa's*, 1924, p. 214. 3 Problem of Bhāsa, *AMV*, 2, pp. 59, 60, 164.

serve to establish their identity.[1] He takes the *Cār* as an abridged version of the *Mṛcch* compiled in 750 A.D., whereas we credit the author of the *Cār* with originality. Internal evidence is against the ascription of the *Padmaprābhṛtaka* to Śūdraka, the author of the *Mṛcch*; both are different persons.

Viṇāvāsavadatta, which is at present being serially published in the Journal of Oriental Research, Madras, bears many resemblances to the Bhāsa plays; but the treatment is quite different, and there are discrepancies in the originals of the Udayana legends used by Bhāsa and the author of the *Viṇā*. The reference to वासवदत्ता सत्रवाय राज्ञे पित्रा दत्तमात्मानमुदयनाय प्रायच्छत् which is also found in the *Mālatī-Mādhava*, places the work after the 7th century, as suggested by Prof. Dhruva.[2] This accords well with the date of Saktibhadra, and lends some support for our assumption that it may be the *Unmāda* by Śaktibhadra, especially as the latter is found to know Bhāsa's works well. The title *Unmāda* may have been changed by some irresponsible scribe, such cases, fortunately, being very rare; and the absence of the names of the author and the work can be explained on the ground of the MS being neither complete nor correct. The find of complete MSS, especially from the other parts of India, will set all doubts at rest as to the authorship and title of the *Viṇā*.

Thus we find that there are at present no other works of Bhāsa besides those published in the T.S.S. No other confirmation besides the statement in the *Arthadyotanikā* on the *Śākuntala* has been found so far, for the inference of a work on dramaturgy by Bhāsa.[3] The catalogues of MSS of various libraries consulted by us do not show traces of any of the still undiscovered compositions of Bhāsa. Private communications from Dr. Keith, Dr. Barnett and Dr. Winternitz also confirm the view that there is at present no MS that is, or can be, ascribed to Bhāsa in the British or Continental Libraries. The Curator of the Government Manuscripts

---

1 Kavi, *Avantisundarikathā*, Intr., p. 8, identifies *Vatsarājacarita* with *Viṇāvāsavadatta*; cf. Sarasvati, *QJMS*, 12, p. 276. 2 *Pradhānani Pratijñā*, 2nd edition, Intr. p. 19, n. 25 & 26; also Bhattanatha Swami, *IA*, 45, p. 192. The reference is to तामदर्शनेश्वरसुतस्य मुनिश्चितोऽपि दातुम्...(I, 4, p. 2) and सत्रवाय दास्यामीति शुल्कं प्रतिगृह्य न दत्तवानिति नन्वस्माकमयम्: I (p. 8) from the *Viṇāvāsavadatta*, Madras Or. Ser. 3 Keith, *SD*, p. 105; Sarup, *Vision*, Intr., p. 37.

Library, Madras, says the same with reference to that Library.

6. ANTHOLOGY VERSES AND VERSES QUOTED BY RHETORICIANS.

Great capital is made of the non-occurrence of a single stanza out of those ascribed to Bhāsa in the published Trivandrum texts. It is argued that as none is found in these plays they are not genuine Bhāsa plays. Dr. Winternitz describes this circumstance as 'fatal'.[1] Mr. R. Raddi further says that these verses are quite different in structure from those that we have in the Trivandrum plays.[2] But the argument is not so sound as it at first sight appears. The absence can be satisfactorily explained.

i. It is not yet proved that Bhāsa wrote only the works that are now available to us. Besides twenty-three or thirty plays, he is said to have composed a poem and also a work on dramaturgy.[3] So, the anthology verses may have been excerpted from such works now lost to us, or the verses may be *sphuṭa ślokas* by Bhāsa,—general verses of a miscellaneous character, without forming part of any particular work.

ii. It may further be urged with some plausibility that these, or at least some of these verses, may have been taken out from some lost recensions of these dramas.[4] Some MSS of the *Abh* are found to contain three stanzas less than the others coming from the same region.[5] The *Svapna* may have contained पादाक्रान्तानि पुष्पाणि etc., and सञ्चितपद्मकवाटं etc; and the *Bāl* and the *Abh* the verses उत्साहातिशयं वत्स etc., and त्रेतायुगं etc. respectively.[6] We have attempted to show later on in this chapter that some of the anthology verses may have formed part of some of the Trivandrum plays.

iii. Again, these anthologists are not trustworthy as they are found to be wrong in various ways and particulars.

1. They are sometimes found to misquote the

---

1 *CR*, Dec. 1924, p. 346 ;(cf. Hirananda Sastri, *MASI*, 28, p. 27. 2 *VJV*, 47, p. 230. 3 Cf. last section. 4 Cf. Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 129. Similar hypothesis as to the verses being from the undiscovered works of Bhāsa has been put forth by Sarup, *Vision*, Intr., p. 37 ; Ghataka, *JDL*, 12, pp. 8-10; Khuperkar, *Lokaśikṣaṇa* 5, pp. 324-325, etc. 5 Cf. *Abhiṣeka*, Lahore edition, pp. 23 n4 ; 38 n4 ; 75 n3. 6 As shown by us in earlier sections.

names of the authors, e.g., different verses of Bhallaṭa in his *Bhallaṭa-śataka* are ascribed to various authors by the anthologists; *e.g.* verses numbers 25, 26, 35 39, etc. are ascribed to Jayavardhana, Janavarmā, Indurāja, Trivikrama, Amṛtadatta, etc. in the *Subhāṣitāvali* and *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*.[1] Out of the verses ascribed to Bhāsa, one, viz., पेया सुरा etc, is found to occur in the *Mattavilāsa* of Mahendravikramavarma which shows that frequently these anthologists depended on memory.

2. Similar with the above is the ascription of the same verse to different writers by different anthologists; and instances will be found in these verses themselves which are ascribed to Bhāsa.[2] The verse दयिताबाहुपाशस्य etc. has been ascribed to Bhāsa by the *Śārṅgadhara*, to Kalaśaka by the *Subhāṣitāvali*, and to Śyāmala by the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*. Similarly कपोले मार्जारः etc. has been assigned to Bhāsa by the *Śārṅgadhara* and *Subhāṣitāvali*, but the *Sūktimuktāvali* by Jalhaṇa ascribes it to Rājaśekhara. It is also well known that लिम्पतीव तमोऽङ्गानि etc. is ascribed to Vikramāditya (*Subhāṣitāvali*), Vikramāditya and Meṇṭha (*Śārṅgadhara*), Daṇḍin or Śūdraka.

iv. Many verses ascribed to Kālidāsa, Aśvaghoṣa and other celebrated dramatists by the anthologists are not found in their extant works, while no one assumes thereby that the extant works are not genuine.[3] Why not have the same treatment to Bhāsa?

The above statements satisfactorily explain the absence of the anthology verses from our plays. But we shall deal with them separately in the light of the previous contributions on the subject.

The stanzas, fifteen in all, are given in an appendix.

1. तीव्रा रविस्तपति etc. We have already shown that this verse, which has been unanimously attributed to Bhāsa by the *Subhāṣitāvali*, *Sadukti*, and *Śārṅgadhara* as also by Dr. Thomas, Dr. Weller and Dr. Sarup, shows many features common to the Bhāsa plays published in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series and hence the latter can

---

1 Khuperkar, *Lokaśikṣaṇa*, 5, pp. 324-325; also Paranjape, *Pratimā*, Intr., pp. XX-XXIII. 2 Cf. References in the above foot-note; also Sivadatta Sarma, *NPP*, 4, pp. 129-133; Ghataka *JDL*, 12, pp. 2-5. 3 Cf. Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 129; Sankar, *AMV*, 2, p. 44.

justifiably be attributed to Bhāsa.[1] The simile of a man made newly rich is heightened in its effect by being qualified by the term 'low-caste man', and aptly describes the fierceness of the sun; the other objects of comparison chosen by the poet, viz. ungrateful man and his friend, sage and his inner consciousness, and poor lover and his love, show the same keen observation of humanity and the same word echoes that are met with in our Bhāsa plays.

2. दुःखार्ते मयि दुःखिता etc. describes an ideal wife. This recalls to one's mind, as rightly pointed out by Dr. Sarup, the lines of the famous poem of Wordsworth:[2]

"A perfect woman nobly planned,
To warm, to comfort and command";

This verse finds its counterparts in many plays of our group. Cf. *Bāl*, p.11 : दुक्खे दुक्खई, पुहे पुहिवी होदि ।; *Prat*, 1. 25 : अनुचरति शशाङ्कं राहुदोषेऽपि तारा ।; *Svapna*, VI. 11 : शिष्या देवी च मे प्रिया ।; *Cār*, 1. 7 : विभवानुचया भार्या ।; *Avi*, IV. 21 : गोष्ठीषु हास्यः ।; etc. The qualities enumerated of an ideal wife in this verse, conform to those which our poet paints his female characters, such as Sītā, Vāsavadattā, etc. to possess. The happiness of her husband is the sole aim of the wife, and her conduct is always regulated by his likes and dislikes, and has to enact many roles as befit the occasion. This verse is uttered by the speaker, presumably in the absence of his wife or during the period of separation, and the sense of the verse shows that he is not newly married. Out of the published texts in the Trivandrum series, we are afraid, the *Mbh* and Kṛṣṇa plays would not accommodate this verse, and Rāma (in the *Prat* and *Abh*) has no occasion to recall the virtues of Sītā, and Avimāraka and Udayana (in the *Pratijñā*) are yet to lead a marital life; so, if at all, we must find a place for the verse in the *Svapna* in the fifth Act, before the famous dream-scene, when the king is reminded of Vāsavadattā by the mention of Ujjayinī in Vidūṣaka's story, and expresses himself in metrical lines (p. 104); or, the verse may occur in the sixth act, in the lamentations of the king

1 Chapter II, pp. 44-45. Supra. Thomas, *JRAS*, 1928, pp. 884-886; Weller, *Festgabe Jacobi*, pp. 117, 120-122; Sarup, *Vision*, Intr., p. 3. 2 *Vision*, Intr., p. 5.

after Vāsavadattā's nurse comes to him with a message from Mahāsena (p. 133).

3. विरहिजनिता वक्त्रौपम्यं etc. is the description of winter with similes, at once apt, striking and original. We again get here 'a man deserted by fortune', 'a newly married bride' and 'a woman separated from her husband', all of whom have their counterparts in the Trivandrum plays. Cf. *Cār*, I. 28: क्षीणे विभवसञ्चये । ; *Pañc*, I. 17 : विभवानां परिक्षयात् । This is a general description; and as none of the plays in our group relates to the freezing wind, we are unable to include it in any of the plays. On account of the similarities of ideas and expressions between the Trivandrum Bhāsa plays and this Bhāsa verse, it may safely be assumed that the verse belonged to some other work of Bhāsa now lost to us.

4. बाला च सा etc. admirably brings out the apparent contradiction (*Virodhābhāsa*) in the first two *pādas*. A similar instance of *Virodhābhāsa* from our plays is found in the *Avi*, p. 6 : (दर्शनीयोऽप्यविस्मितः, तरुणोऽप्यनहंकारः, शूरोऽपि दाक्षिण्यवान्, सुकुमारोऽपि बलवान्) .[1] Our plays do not contain any heroine that can be said to be young and at the same time expert in all amorous sports; taking, however, the description to be applicable to Kuraṅgī, we may place the verse somewhere in the fifth act of the *Avi*, where the hero has a chat with his friend (pp. 76 et seq).

5. यद्पि बिम्बैः etc. has been ascribed to Bhojadeva in the *Sūkti* and to Lakṣmīdhara in the *Kavindravacanasamuccaya* (No. 163), while the *Sadukti*, *Yaśastilaka* and Jalhaṇa attribute it to Bhāsa.[2] This ascription to different authors in different anthologies casts some doubt on Bhāsa's authorship of this verse, and Dr. Sarup's acceptance of this verse as composed by Bhāsa is open to objection according to his own dictum, as this stanza has been attributed to different poets and hence 'should be regarded as of doubtful authorship'.[3] Dr. Weller finds a parallel for विषं च विलोचने in the *Avi*, II.7 : दृष्टिविषं मनोज्ञम्.[4] The poet has shown the play of his vivid imagination by comparing various parts of the face of a beautiful damsel to the celestial flowers (सुरसुमनसः), moon, ambrosia and poison, and stating that all of these latter,

---

1 Weller, *Festgabe Jacobi*, p. 118. 2 Sivadatta Sarma, *NPP*, 4, p. 181.
3 Vision. Intr., p. 3. 4 *Festgabe Jacobi*, p. 117.

each one of which gods obtained with great effort by churning the ocean, are to be found on the faces of beautiful women, without any effort.

6. प्रत्यासन्नविवाहमङ्गल etc. has been ascribed to Bhāsa in the *Sadukti*, and the *Śārṅgadhara* does not mention the name of the poet. Dr. Thomas, on the strength of the striking resemblance between this verse and the opening verses of the *Ratnāvalī*, *Priyadarśikā* and *Pārvatīpariṇaya*, concludes that it may be "old, and connected with Bhāsa."[1] This verse is of the nature of a *maṅgala* stanza, and hence, though it may have come from Bhāsa, it would not find a place in our Bhāsa plays.

As regards (7) कठिनहृदये etc., (8) कृतकृतकैः etc., and (9) दग्धे मनोभवतरौ etc. we are inclined to doubt the authorship of Bhāsa as the ideas they express are foreign to him, and there is no occasion for such sentiments in the Trivandrum plays. *Śārṅgadhara*, moreover, speaks about कृतकृतकैः etc. as coming from an unknown poet (कस्यापि). दग्धे मनोभवतरौ etc. is a good instance of paronomasia.

10. अस्या ललाटे etc. has been ascribed to some unknown poet (कस्यापि) by the *Subhāṣitāvali*. Similar ideas are found expressed in the *Avi* and perhaps it may be located in that play on p. 78.

11. कपोले मार्जारः etc., in spite of its ascription to Rājaśekhara in the *Sūkti*, may have come from Bhāsa. The tricks played by the moon, proud of its splendour, with different persons when its rays cast their resplendence on different objects in succession are beautifully told in this verse. The description of the moon is a favourite one with Bhāsa and is found in various plays of our group.[2]

12. दयिता बाहुपाशस्य etc. has been ascribed to Bhāsa by the *Śārṅgadhara*, while the *Subhāṣitāvali* states Kalaśaka as its author and *Sadukti* states Śyāmala. But Dr. Thomas finds a similarity between this verse and *Ratnāvali* (III.60-61), which latter he takes as containing Bhāsa echoes and states "that the verse may be really of Bhāsa".[3] It may, however, be stated that it cannot find any place in our group.

13. पेया सुरा etc. which is found in the *Mattavilāsa*

---

1 *JRAS*, 1928, p. 884. 2 Cf. Weller, *Festgabe Jacobi*, pp. 123-124; also Deodhar, *Plays etc.*, pp. 3, 5. 3 *JRAS*, 1928, p. 884. The comparison of Mistress' arms to the hangman's noose is common.

(p. 7, v. 7) has been ascribed to Bhāsa by Somadeva; he is obviously wrong in the ascription and this fact does not warrant any inference as to the authorship of the *Mattavilāsa* as the verse occurs there as a Subhāṣita. Somadeva need not be accused of gross negligence as it may be that he knew of the verse as not the composition of Mahendravikramavarman (the author of the *Mattavilāsa*) and ascribed it to Bhāsa, possibly on account of similar Bacchic songs found in the *Pratijñā* (Act IV. 2, 11). Bhāsa's works had long been out of currency in the public, and hence Somadeva had to depend on oral tradition only.

14. पादाक्रान्तानि पुण्याणि etc. and (15) त्रेतायुगे etc. have already been shown to find their places in the *Svapna* and *Abh* respectively.[1]

Mr. Narayana Sastri of Madras has ascribed

एको हि दोषो गुणसन्निपाते
निमज्जतीन्दोरिति यो बभाषे।
नूनं न दृष्टं कविनापि तेन
दारिद्र्यदोषो गुणराशिनाशी॥

to Bhāsa without giving any authority for the statement; and has woven a fabric out of this slender evidence as to Bhāsa's being distressed by poverty etc.[2] But that this stanza cannot be ascribed to (the pre-Kālidāsan) Bhāsa is evident from the fact that it refers to the well known saying of Kālidāsa in the *Kumārasambhava, viz.*

एको हि दोषो गुणसन्निपाते
निमज्जतीन्दोः किरणेष्विवाङ्कः।

and the latter certainly came after Bhāsa.

Dr. Sarup regards those stanzas as composed by Bhāsa "which are unanimously attributed to Bhāsa by all the anthologists".[3] According to him, ten stanzas out of the collection (which are Nos. 1-10 in our list) may be accepted as from Bhāsa. Dr. Weller, in a learned and thoughtful article contributed to *Festgabe Jacobi*, has proved on internal evidence that six of the stanzas (*i.e.* Nos. 1-5 and 11 in our list) are similar in thought, ideas and expression to those contained in the Trivandrum

1 Supra, pp. 30-31; 45-47. 2 Cf. *Priyadarśikā*, Intr., pp. XXII-XXIII. It may be noted that the stanza has been put in the *Subhāṣitāvali* as 'कस्यापि' 3 Vision, Intr., p. 4.

plays; but his suggestion that the anthologists ascribed verses to Bhāsa as they felt the spirit of his poetry in them seems to be far-fetched.[1] Dr. Thomas, as already stated, considers four stanzas (*viz.* Nos. 1, 6, 10 and 12 in our list) as coming from Bhāsa; he further finds that four stanzas in the collection are "of a tenor which would not admit of a place in any of the Trivandrum plays".[2] We have expressed our views on the point.

We cannot close our investigation without quoting in extenso from the critical appreciation of these stanzas, admirably expressed by Dr. Sarup: "These stanzas display keen observation, vivid imagination, great power of description, a remarkable intellectual quality and a refreshing originality. Their substance and their style, their matter and their manner, stamp them with a rare mark of beauty. These lyrics are the impassioned expressions of the poet's inmost soul. They breathe the genuine accents of poetry. They are chiselled pieces of marble. They are exquisite little pictures".[3]

---

1 *Festgabe Jacobi*, pp. 114-125, at p. 125. "It is" of course, "commonsense to assume", with Dr. Keith, "that the ascriptions are correct". (*HSL*, Preface, p. xvi). 2 *JRAS*, 1928, p. 883. 3 *HR*, 50, p. 117.

CHAPTER V.

CRITICAL STUDY *(Contd.)*

7. CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF THE PLAYS.

So far as we could see, only three attempts have been made to fix the order of the plays of this group. Prof. Dhruva bases his conclusions solely on the informations supplied by the *Bharatavākyas* of the plays, apparently paying no heed to the language evidence and the thought evidence and hence has arrived at such strange and unacceptable inferences as to place the *Prat*, the masterpiece of Bhāsa as his earliest work, and the *Dv* to the last period in the poet's career![1] Mr. Karandikar has not attempted to fix the order of the plays in the *Mbh* group, has placed the *Avi* in the later period and has taken the *Svapna* as coming after the *Cār.*[2] Kirāta seems to have paid more attention to the evolution of thought and psychology than considering the point from the joint evidence of matter and manner, and hence he takes the *Abh* to have been composed after the *Prat.*[3]

In spite of the dissenting note of the *Kesari* while reviewing Kirāta's Marathi translation of Bhāsa's works,[4] the chronological method has its own advantages, though it may fail to lodge us at the correct conclusion in very rare and exceptional cases. It explains the apparent differences between the works of the same author; it is well known that all the compositions of a single author are not equal in merits. Different periods in the creative faculty alone explained the wide gulf of difference that lay between the earliest and latest works of Shakespeare. In

1 *Svapnani Sundari*, Intr., pp. 22-25. 2 Intr. to Hivargaokar's Marathi Trans., Vol. 2, p. 6. 3 Marathi Trans, preface, pp. 7-8. 4 *Kesari*, Marathi bi-weekly of Poona, dated 1/4/1932 at p. 2.

the case of Bhāsa also, the chronological order of his plays will dispense with the necessity of attributing the works to different authors and to different periods, and will conclusively account for the diversities in the metrical proportions or in the choice of the material or in the manner of treatment. In coming to the conclusion of the common authorship of these plays we have taken into consideration the similarities of thoughts (*i. e.* of the spirit) and ideals in them, in addition to innumerable verbal similarities.

We have studied the problem of the chronological order from the point of the matter and manner of these plays. For the latter, we depend on the metrical and the dialogue evidence, and for the former on characterization,

	Total Number of:			Number of		Percentage.			
	D.	V.	Ś.	P.L.	W. E.	D:V.	V:Ś.	Ś: P.L.	Ś: W.E.
Dv	76	56	22	4	10	73	39'3	18'2	45'4.
Karṇa	70	25	4	...	...	35'7	16	...	...
Dgh	125	52	22	4		41'8	42	18'2	18'2.
Ūru	150	66	12	2	5	44	18	16'6	41'6.
Mv	181	51	33	6	8	28	64'5	18'2	24'2.
Pañc	410	155	79	4	15	37'8	51	5	19.
Abh	388	154	68	11	23	39'6	44	16'2	33'8.
Bāl	324	103	37	3	10	31'4	36	8'1	27.
Avi	633	97	15	1	7	15'3	15'5	6'6	46'6.
Prat	688	157	75	5	20	22'8	47'8	6'6	26'6.
Pratijñā	441	67	29	2	9	12'9	43	6'9	31.
Sv	510	57	26	6	6	11'1	45'5	23	23.
Cār	488	55	17	...	5	11'2	30'9	...	30.

D = Dialogues; V = Verses; S = Ślokas; P.L. = Poetic Licences; W. E. = Weak endings.

ideas and ideals etc. The table appended herewith will clear our position with regard to the outward form of these plays. In the table we have given the total numbers of verses, *ślokas* and dialogues in each play as also of the irregularities in the *ślokas*, which, following Prof. Dhruva we have styled as "poetic licence" (where there is a breach of the rule as to the iambus in the third foot of every *pāda*), and "weak ending" (where the last syllable of the line is short).[1]

We find three distinct periods in the career of our poet. The first was of the small one-act plays where the poet tried his apprentice hand on ready material. The plots are taken from the *Mbh*, and the poet has added nothing, or very little of his own in the dramas. The epic metre predominates and the proportion of the verses to the dialogues is very large. Gradually, as the poet came to understand the importance and the appeal of the dialogues in the representation of the dramatic compositions, on the stage, there was an increase in the number of dialogues and hence the proportion of the verses to the dialogues is gradually on the decrease in the latter productions of the poet. In versification, the percentage of the breaches of the rule as to di-iambus varies between sixteen and eighteen, and that of the weak endings shows great divergences, the variations being eighteen to forty-five. No strict rule can be stated with regard to the weak endings, as some of the mature products of our poet, *e.g.*, the *Svapna*, *Pratijñā*, and *Cār*, show a large percentage, *viz*, 23, 31, and 30 respectively. In connection with the "poetic licence", it may safely be assumed that the number of such cases is gradually less and less in the later works, and, curiously enough, the *Svapna* is an exception with twenty-three percent of such lapses. The *Karṇa* from the *Mbh* plays is unique in that it shows a very low proportion of *ślokas* and presents no breach of rules as to the *di-iambus* and the long letter ending the line ; the reason may be found in the very small number of *ślokas* (*viz.* 4) in the *Karṇa*. The *Ūru* in common with the *Karṇa*, shows a low percentage of the epic metre, which can be accounted for on the ground of the requirements of the heroic and tragic sentiments predominating these plays, which demand the use of long

1 *Parākramank Prasādi*, 1923, Intr., pp. 22-25 ; *Thakkar Lectures*, pp. 82, 118, 126.

metres. The *Mv* has been taken as the last work of this period, though the epic metre has weighed very heavily with the poet, as it shows the poet at his best, with an original underplot, interspersed with genuine humour.

The *Pañc* marks a transition in that the poet shows his inventive genius in the weaving of the plot, has increased the number of acts as well as the number of characters. The proportion of the dialogues is also favourable to assigning this play to a later period than the composition of the one-act plays. The *Pañc* shows the least percentage of poetic licence, that for weak endings being nineteen. Just on the heels of the *Pañc*, come the *Abh* and *Bāl*, as there are to be seen numerous similarities of ideas and expression, the employment of song and dance and the ascription of divinities to Rāma and Kṛṣṇa in these plays. The proportion of the epic metre also does not militate against the middle period being assigned to these plays; the proportion of the dialogues to the verses is on the decrease as indicated above, showing an increase in the number of dialogues. In both of these plays, the poet has added very little of his own to the events in the lives of the heroes as known from the epics. The *Abh* seems to have been written by the poet specially to celebrate the coronation of his patron king and, perhaps, it was written in haste. It cannot come after the *Prat*, though the latter contains the record of the earlier events from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, as, in addition to the outer forms (*e.g.* proportions of *ślokas*, dialogues, lapses and weak endings) being against such a state of affairs, the originality in the plot and the general execution of the *Prat* speak conclusively against the two plays being composed in the same period. Much less can the *Abh* be assigned to a later period in the poet's career.

The *Avi* again, belongs to the period of transition as the proportion of dialogues is much increased and there is to be seen a very low percentage of the epic metre. In fact, both these data speak of a later period for the *Avi*, but the internal evidence is against it. The erotic element plays a leading part in this play and hence this should be assigned to the early days in the career of the poet. The element of humour as also the large number of dialogues, poetic descriptions, etc. separate this play from the earlier

Mbh, Rāma and Kṛṣṇa plays. The supernatural elements of the curse, the magic ring, and the appearance of the fairies link this play with the *Abh* and *Bāl*, and it was written, perhaps, a little after these two plays. Exigencies of the different sentiments necessitated employment of other metres and hence the proportion of the epic metre is very low.

The *Prat*, *Pratijñā*, *Svapna* and *Cār* are the finished products of the final period, which is characterized by minute and psychological characterization, employment of a greater number of dialogues, reduction in the percentage of poetic licences and a general decrease in the proportion of the epic metre, its percentage being 40 to 45. Strictly applying the dialogue test, the *Prat* shows a period earlier than the *Avi* and after the *Abh* and *Bāl*, but on the strength of the internal evidence and the general impression it creates, we have assigned the *Prat* to this period. The dialogues show a gradual increase with the result that two of the last works, *viz.*, the *Svapna* and *Cār*, have one act each, containing no verse at all.

Thus, we think that the dialogue test is of great value in coming to the chronological order of these plays.

8. PRAKRIT OF THE PLAYS.

In considering the 'Date of Bhāsa' we had occasion to refer to the views of different scholars containing a gulf of over 1500 years between the earliest time assigned to Bhāsa and the latest one. One would naturally expect the same distance of time among the estimates from Prakrits by these scholars ; but that is not the case, as the printed texts present a Prakrit which is similar to, at least, the southern MSS of Kālidāsa according to the anti-Bhāsaites. Those that place Bhāsa some centuries before Christ have no positive comparative material to work with and have to satisfy themselves with the modern look of Bhāsa's Prakrit owing to the well-known fact about 'dramatic Prakrit' that "the copyists always changed the Prakrit of their authors into the Prakrit current in their own time".[1]

Prof. V. Lesny in an article entitled "Die Entwicklungsstufe des Prakrits in Bhasas dramen und das Zeitaltern Bhasas" assigns Bhāsa to the first half of the fourth century A.D. on linguistic grounds.[2] On comparing

1 MM. Haraprasada Sastri's letter quoted in *Pratimā*, Ganapati Sastri's Edn. 1924. Intr., pp. 15-16, foot-note. 2 *ZDMG*, 72, pp. 203-208.

the Prakrit in the Trivandrum plays with that of Aśvaghoṣa and Kālidāsa, he finds our author to be younger than the former and older than the latter. Dr. Winternitz has also expressed a similar opinion.[1] Dr. Sten Konow also places Bhāsa's plays at least one century after Aśvaghoṣa, *i. e.*, in the third or fourth century A.D.[2] Dr. Banerji Sastri has critically examined various forms in Prakrit, and he controverts the views of the above scholars placing Bhāsa a century after Aśvaghoṣa. In his opinion, Aśvaghoṣa and Bhāsa were probably closely proximate in time, each unknown or of little importance to the other.[3] Dr. Keith finds the Prakrit of Bhāsa in an intermediate stage between Aśvaghoṣa and Kālidāsa and has treated as of minor importance the retention of similar forms in South Indian MSS of later dates.[4] Dr. Sukthankar with his usual scholarly insight, critical faculty, and unbiassed judgment in weighing evidence, has studied the problem at length and on the strength of a number of affinities that the Prakrit in our dramas presents with that of Aśvaghoṣa concludes that "there lies in the dramas before us a solid bedrock of archaic Prakrit which is older than any we know from the dramas of the so-called classical period of Sanskrit literature".[5] It may be noted here, however, that on knowing that in Malayalam MSS of Kālidāsa and Harṣa, and in the MSS of southern dramatists of the sixth and later centuries, similar Prakrit archaisms are met with, in a genuine scholarly spirit, Dr. Sukthankar later on admits that "Prakrit archaisms have no probative value for antiquity or authorship of the plays".[6] Dr. Thomas seems to hold Bhāsa earlier than Kālidāsa on the ground of Prakrit peculiarities also.

With reference to the views expressed above, placing our author between Aśvaghoṣa and Kālidāsa we feel, with Prof. Devdhar, 'certainly amused with these frantic efforts of scholars to relegate our author to a time' posterior to Aśvaghoṣa 'on what is in fact insufficient data. While all deplore the loss of Aśvaghoṣa's works they hazard conclusions from the little crumbs left by time'.[7] It is to be noted further, that we have placed Aśvaghoṣa after

---

1 *Festschrift Kuhn*, p. 301; *Cl. CR*, Dec. 1924, p. 339. 2 *IA*, 43, pp. 65-66. 3 *JRAS*, 1921, pp. 372-377 at p. 377. 4 *SD*, pp. 120-122. "The evidence... is interesting, but does not alter the importance of these forms". *SD*, p. 121 n1. 5 *JAOS*, 40, pp. 248-259 at p. 259. 6 *JBRAS*, 1925, pp. 103-117; 126-143; at p. 140. 7 *Plays etc.*, p. 49.

Bhāsa on account of a common verse found in their works. Prof. Dhruva on the basis of metrical grounds places Kālidāsa in 57 B.C., thus endorsing the traditional view, and finds Aśvaghoṣa posterior in time because the latter uses long metres and also those that came into use later on.[1] His Sanskrit thus is found to be later than that of Kālidāsa. Dr. Keith has assigned priority to Aśvaghoṣa, but he says about Aśvaghoṣa that he "was more complex than Bhāsa and certainly so in his epics",[2] which in our opinion, should indicate the priority of Bhāsa. MM. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, a prominent Sanskrit scholar and an anti-Bhāsaite, assigns first century B.C. to Kālidāsa and pronounces Aśvaghoṣa to be subsequent to him.[3] In view of all these things, it seems rather strange that the scholars mentioned above should take the anteriority of Aśvaghoṣa to Kālidāsa as an axiomatic truth. While no one places Aśvaghoṣa earlier than the first century A.D., fresh evidence is coming forward of the existence of a Vikramāditya in the first century B.C., which would render probable the existence of his court poet, Kālidāsa.[4] With regard to the antiquity of the Prakrits used by Aśvaghoṣa as found in the fragments of his plays in the Turfan MSS and the comparatively late Prakrit as found in Kālidāsa, we have to bear in mind that Prakrit is much more liable to be changed at the hands of the scribes and scholars than the Sanskrit portions in the MSS of Sanskrit dramas, "with the result that the same Prakrit texts will be found in bewilderingly different forms in different MSS".[5] The arguments about date based on the character of Prakrit are therefore reliable and of value only if contemporary MSS are taken into account.

Dr. Raja and Messrs. Pisharotis on the other hand, deny any antiquity to the Prakrit as is represented by the Trivandrum plays, and declare it to be a "mixture of old and later Prakrit".[6] The literary history and tradition in Kerala is recalled where Prakrit had only a literary existence. It was not a spoken language and hence was

1 *Parākramank Prasādi*, 1923, Intr., pp. 5-20 ; 46-49 ; *Thakkar Lectures*, pp. 204-212. 2 *SD*, p. 115. 3 *Padyacūḍāmaṇi*, Madras, 1921, preface, p. 5. 4 Cf. Mukhopadhyaya, *MR*, 51, pp. 650-654; 52, pp. 28-33; also, Shembavnekar, *JBU*, 1, pp. 232-246; as well as the references given in the foot-note in Chapter III on the date of Kālidāsa. 5 Chattopadhyaya, *AUS*, 2, p. 141. 6 Raja, *ZII*, 2, pp. 247-264 at p. 259 ; A.K. Pisharoti, *Criticism*, pp. 24-25 ; K. R. Pisharoti *IHQ*, 1, pp. 330-340 ; 5, p. 557 ; *Shama'a*, 5, pp. 179-186 ; *BSOS*, 3, pp. 108-109 ; 5, pp. 307-310 ; Barnett, *JRAS*, 1921, pp. 587-589 ; Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, pp. 48-54.

not subject to any changes as were the Prakrits in the North. The changes that were introduced in the literary Prakrit of the dramas in the South were due to literary works coming from the North which contained the changed and developed forms, especially dramas. Prakrit in the South was thus uninfluenced by the vernacular in the land. Hence the Southern dramas of the tenth century such as the *Subhadrā-Dhanañjaya*, *Tapatī-Saṁvaraṇa*, *Āścarya-Cūḍāmaṇi* etc., have the same archaic forms as are found in our plays. So, "the queerness of Prakrit reveals not its antiquity but its queer position in Kerala".[1]

Dr. Barnett first announced this peculiar position the Prakrit occupied in the Southern MSS.[2] MSS of our dramas are only three hundred years old and hence we cannot say for certain that they used the same forms of Prakrit as left by the original authors. Pandits and copyists took great liberties with the texts and the forms that they did not understand or could not appreciate were changed as they liked. Dr. Hertel in his introduction to the *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* accepts the Prakrit in the printed texts of Bhāsa plays as older than that of the printed texts of Kālidāsa, but the Trivandrum Series editions, according to him, are uncritical and incorrect.[3] This at least, we feel certain, must be acceptable to all that our plays do not, at any rate, present Prakrit in a later phase than is found in Kālidāsa. This peculiar feature in the Southern MSS has led Dr. Sukthankar, Dr. Sarup, Dr. Clark and others to regard the Prakrit in our plays with scepticism and not to venture any conclusions as to chronology or otherwise therefrom.[4] Mention must also be made of an illuminating article on "Sanskrit and Prakrit in the Ārya Eḻuttu" published by Prof. K.R. Pisharoti throwing much light on the script and scribes of Kerala.[5] He concludes that the peculiar position of Prakrit in Malayalam MSS of Sanskrit dramas popular on the local stage is due to (*i*) linguistic grounds *i. e.* excessive nasalization (of which we get instances in ञ० अडत्त, ड० सरह, etc., in Dr. Sarup's MS, MS of the *Bhagavadajjukīya*, *Abh* etc.; and (*ii*) scribal peculiarities such as 't' for 'l' etc, which are kept in Prakrit portions.

1 K. R. Pisharoti, *Śāma'a* 5, p. 181. Cf. the articles by Prof. K. R. Pisharoti mentioned in the preceding foot-note; also Raja, *ZII*. 2, pp. 259-260. 2 *JRAS*, 1921, p. 589. 3 Cf. *BSOS*, 3, p. 586. 4 Sukthankar, *JBBRAS*, 1925, pp. 116-117, 132-133, 140; Sarup, *Vision*, preface, pp. V-VI; Clark, *JAOS*, 44, pp. 101-102. 5 *BSOS*, 5, pp. 307-310.

He has warned the readers towards the close of his article to bear these peculiarities in mind while studying the Prakrit of these dramas from printed texts alone.

MM. Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri and MM. Haraprasad Sastri take the Prakrits in Bhāsa plays as belonging to the pre-Aśokan period. The former explains the alleged similarity in Prakrit forms between Bhāsa plays and Kālidāsa on the ground that "Prakrit being no longer a spoken language, could undergo no change";[1] and hence Kālidāsa's Prakrit conforms to that in Bhāsa; and further, were a Pandit of this day to write a drama in Sanskrit and to follow the customary practice of using Prakrit, he will have to use forms as are found in older dramas and that will certainly not make our modern Pandit belong to the old period to which his Prakrit may be assigned. According to Dr. Sastri, the forms in Prakrit, therefore, are immaterial for determining the age; but their Sanskrit equivalents are "as simple and sweet as the original Sanskrit sentences of the author, and along with the latter enable us to determine their age".[2] MM. Haraprasad Sastri, as already observed, explains the modern look of Prakrits as being due to the copyists changing the forms.

We shall now consider the problem according to our own light taking help from the writings of scholars wherever necessary. Unfortunately, no critical work on the Southern Prakrit grammarians has been published that would have cleared the ambiguity which the dramatic texts in that province show in regard to Prakrit. The extant grammars on Prakrit from the North hail from a comparatively late period, and hence it is rather precarious to classify the Prakrit of our dramas on their basis.[3] It is said that Bhāsa uses Māgadhī and Śaurasenī, and the dialect of Indra in the *Karṇa* is taken to be Ardhamāgadhī.[4] We

1 G. Sastri, *Critical Study*, pp. 53–54, 57, 60–66, 95, at p. 53; H. Sastri, *Critical Study*, p. 54 note. 2 *Critical Study* p. 95. 3 Cf. Bhandarkar, *Wilson Philological Lectures*. 4 Dr. Printz (*Bhāsa's Prakrit*, p. 6) has styled the dialect of cowherds in the *Pañc* and the *Bāl* as *Māgadhī*, but "Nur als Nothehelf" (only as a make-shift). Dr. Banerji Sastri does not include it in Māgadhī as, according to him, the speeches of Unmattaka in the *Pratijñā* and Śakāra in the *Cār* constitute Māgadhī in Bhāsa (*JBORS*, 1923, pp. 81–113); and Dr. Sukthankar (*JBRAS*, 1925, p. 105) following Dr. Weller (*Bālacarita*, Vorwort, p. III) takes it as a variety of Śaurasenī. Dr. Keith seems to suggest it as a Māgadhī Apabhraṁśa (*SD*, p. 122). As regards the dialect of Indra, Dr. Keith (*SD*, p. 122) Konow (*ID*, p. 11) Woolner (*Prakrit*, p. 75) take it as Ardha-Māgadhī. It may be noted that Bhāsa's dramas contain no Mahārāṣṭrī, "the Prakrit *par excellence* of Vararuci" (Keith, *BSOS*, 3, p. 296); the absence according to Dr. Barnett (*BSOS*, 3, p. 519) may be due to the fact that the Southern play-wrights usually avoid Mahārāṣṭrī.

would, however, like to say with Dr. Clark that mixed dialects are used by Bhāsa, and they cannot be reduced "to the grammatical norms of Śaurasenī and Māgadhī."[1] Printed texts, further, are based on scanty manuscript material.

The main peculiarities of the Prakrit as presented by the Trivandrum texts are :

BHĀSA :	PĀLI :	AŚVAGHOṢA :	CLASSICAL PLAYS :
n > ṇ	n > n	n > n	n > ṇ
y > y or j	y > y	y > y	y > j
bh > h	bh > h	bh > bh	bh > h[2]
ry > yy	ry > yy	ry > yy	ry > jj
jñ > ññ or ṇṇ	jñ > ññ	jñ > ññ	jñ > ṇṇ
ny or ṇy > ṇṇ		ny > ññ	ny > ṇṇ
udy > uyy	udy > uyy		udy > ujj
Acc pl mas. -āṇi.	Acc pl mas[3] -aṇi, āni (Aśoka inscr. AMg)		Acc pl mas. -e
Nom Acc plu Neut. -āṇi	Nom Acc plu Neut. -āni	Nom Acc plu Neut. -āni	Nom Acc plu Neut. -aim
Loc Sing Fem āam	Loc Sing Fem āyam		Loc Sing Fem -āe
tava			tuha
kissa	kissa	kiśśa	kīsa
Ganhadi	Gaṇhāti	Geṇhadi[4]	Geṇhadi
karia			kadua
gacchia			gadua

'*Mā*' is used along with the gerund, imperative and infinitive. As regards *mā*, Prof. Subramanya Iyer has considered the problem in detail in all its aspects and he concludes : "While these peculiarities are not special to the plays ascribed to Bhāsa and they appear in other dramas found in Kerala, we have not sufficient evidence yet to believe that they are peculiar to Kerala. We can only say that so far they are found chiefly in Kerala."[5]

Now, it has been shown that many of these forms are found in the Southern dramas of a quite late period.[6] But it cannot be denied as has been observed by Dr. Sukthankar that these forms are 'archaic' *i. e.*, belong to the old Prakrit.[7] A number of articles were contributed

1 *JAOS*, 44, p. 101. 2 And on their analogy all the aspirates kh, gh, th, dh, and ph. 3 Keith *SD*, p. 122. 4 Keith, *SD*, p. 122. 5 *OC*, V, pp. 616-629 at p. 629. 6 Hiramanda Sastri, *MASI*, 28, pp. 19-20 ; Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, pp. 50-53 ; Clark, *JAOS*, 44, p. 101. 7 *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 115 n 23.

by Dr. Barnett and Dr. Thomas with regard to the accusative plural masculine in '-āni.'[1] It may, of course, be true as has been observed by Dr. Barnett on the authority of Pischel that accusative plural of masculine stems in '-a' was '-e' as in Pāli or 'ā'[2]. The *Mattavilāsa* has been shown to confirm the plural in '-é'[3]. But it should be noted that the regular forms in '-e' do not occur in Bhāsa[4]. There should be no doubt as to the genuineness of the old form in '-āni'. The absence of the later form indicates the priority of Bhāsa's Prakrit. Occurrence of all these forms in the Southern MSS has, of course, rendered chronological deductions form Prakrit quite inconclusive ; but we have already arrived at some period for Bhāsa on independent grounds ; and making room for scribal inaccuracies, we find that the Prakrit compares favourably with that of the Pāli canon in the pre-Mauryan period. Thus fortified with a definite date for Bhāsa, we think that the Southern works and Kālidāsa's works in Southern MSS have been affected by the usage of Bhāsa. It is clear that quite late dramas use forms of the Prakrit of Bhāsa doubtless as a result of his great influence, just as the dramas recently published from the Southern MSS show frequent signs of borrowing ideas and style from Bhāsa....[5]. If, on the other hand, the Prakrit as represented by the MSS is to be dismissed as not giving any ***result***, we may, with Dr. Sastri, take its Sanskrit equivalent into consideration. These are certainly by Bhāsa ; and they bear the stamp of his authorship by the remarkable similarity they bear with the remaining portions in the dramas by their simplicity, expressiveness and peculiarly conversational style.

It is true that one's judgment as to the Prakrit of Bhāsa should be suspended till more material and enlightenment are forthcoming. We have simply stated our views after the study of the available material and of the plays. No wild conjectures unsupported by facts have been made and it is hoped that this section will serve at least as a resumé of what has been written so far about Bhāsa's Prakrit.[6].

---

1 Barnett, *JRAS*, 1924, pp. 193, 655-656. ; Thomas, *JRAS*, 1914, pp. 449-450; 1925, pp. 104-107. 2 *JRAS*, 1914, p. 655. 3 *BSOS*, 2, p. 35. 4 *JRAS*, 1925, p. 105. 5 Keith, *HSL*, preface, p. XIII. 6 The publication of Dr. Katre's monograph on Prakrits is anxiously awaited for elucidation.

9. BHĀSA AND BHARATA'S NĀṬYAŚĀSTRA.

While considering the question of the unity of authorship of the Trivandrum plays we took into account the common forms of technique used by the author. Actual representations on the stage of violent scenes, deaths, sleep, etc., prohibited by Bharata are to be seen in these plays. In addition, we may note the tragic end of the *Ūru*, the sub-divisions of the *Rūpakas* not strictly according to their definitions in Bharata, etc. Dr. Banerji Sastri has enumerated some other instances of the breach of the express injunctions and prohibitions as well as of the directory rules given in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*[1]. Dr. Charpentier draws attention to a passage in the *Dv*, *viz.*, आचार्य ! एतत् कुर्मासनम्, आस्यताम् । पितामह ! एतत् सिंहासनम्, आस्यताम् । मातुल ! एतद्वर्मासनम्, आस्यताम् । where various seats are offered to different personages by Duryodhana. The *Nāṭyaśāstra*, on the other hand, prescribes the allotment of seats in the following manner : (XIII. 208-209).

देवानां नृपतीनां च दद्यात् सिंहासनं द्विजः ।
पुरोधसाममात्यानां भवेद्भद्रासनं तथा ॥
मुण्डासनं च दातव्यं सेनानीयुवराजयोः ।
काष्ठासनं ब्राह्मणानां कुमाराणां कृथासनम् ॥

Our author follows the *Nāṭyaśāstra* only in offering a *simhāsana* to Bhīṣma, a royal person. Dr. Charpentier expresses the possibility of Bhāsa following another *Nāṭyaśāstra*.[2]. According to Dr. Lindenau, Bhāsa knew an older recension of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*[3].

In face of the differences between Bhāsa and Bharata as indicated above, we fail to see how " le théâtre de Bhāsa se conforme scrupuleusement aux règles classiques de l' Aristote indien, Bharata"[4]. It is also partly true that "Bhāsa disregards altogether the rules of dramaturgy laid down by Bharata[5]. On account of Bhāsa's disregard of the rules of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, he may be taken to have preceded the extant Bharata *Nāṭyaśāstra*.

It is contended by the antagonists that some of the South Indian dramas of a known later date present some of the so-called Bhāsa features and show some prohibited scenes on the stage, and hence such non-observance

1 *JBORS*, 1923, pp. 62-65. 2 *JRAS*, 1923, pp. 607-608. 3 *BS*, p. 29. 4 Lévi, Vāsavadattā, Paris, 1914, preface, III, quoted in *BS*, p. 29. 5 Haraprasad Sastri, *JASB*, 1912, quoted in *JRAS*, 1921, p. 870.

does not necessarily mean priority to Bharata, but contemporaneity or posteriority to the period of stage reformation in Kerala.[1] We have already refuted the charge levelled against Bhāsa's works that they are stage adaptations or compilations. Neither Kālidāsa, nor any other well-known dramatist, breaks the rules of Bharata. The Kerala theatre shows much Bhāsa influence, which was due to his plays being closely studied. Actual representation and practical experience proved these plays wonderfully suited to the stage, and the rule as to the prohibition of certain scenes such as battles, deaths, sleep, etc. on the stage, seems to have been slackened on Bhāsa's precedent and authority, especially as there appears to be no other sanction for the practice.

Now, scholars are not at one as to the date of Bharata. He is placed variously from the second century B. C. to the fourth century A. D.[2]. It will be readily admitted that the *Nāṭyaśāstra* that we have at present, has had some revisions after its first composition, and no one assigns to it the divine origin and hoary antiquity that it demands. That Bhāsa knew a *Nāṭyaśāstra* as distinct from a *Naṭasūtra* or *Nāṭyasūtra* mentioned by Pāṇini follows from his reference in the *Avi* (p. 16 अत्थि रामाअणं णाम बहुसत्थं ।) Bharata himself writes about his predecessors in the field;[3] and we have the testimony of Patañjali of the second century B. C., as to the acting of a full-fledged drama about the killing of Kaṁsa in his own time. So, the principles of dramaturgy on which that dramatic piece might have been based would naturally point to some period anterior to the second century B. C., *i. e.*, before the upper limit assigned for the present Bharata *Nāṭyaśāstra*. So Bhāsa probably followed the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of some predecessor of Bharata; or else, it may be that he followed his own *Nāṭyaśāstra* which is now lost to us; in that case, Bhāsa must be taken to have based his work of dramaturgy on some texts quite distinct and different from those laid under contribution by Bharata.

It has been argued that if Bhāsa is prior to Bharata,

---

1 *Cf.* Pisharoti, *IHQ*, 1, pp. 333-340; *BSOS*, 3, pp. 111-115; Raja, *ZII*, 2, pp. 258-259. 2 Haraprasad Sastri—second century B. C.; Kane and Keith—third century A. D.; Dhruva—fourth century A. D. 3 *Cf. Bhāratīya Nāṭya Śāstra* by G. Ketkar, p. 14; Kane, *OC*, VI, p. 577. Kohala, Vatsa, Śāndilya, Dhūrtila, Śvāti, Nārada, and Puṣkara are Bharata's fore-runners. It seems rather curious that he does not mention the *Naṭa Sūtras* referred to by Pāṇini.

why is there no reference to the former in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*? The reason is to be found in the divine origin of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*; any reference to a known dramatist would have conflicted with its avowed antiquity and would have lowered the work in the estimation of the public according to the composer. Further, we can find an indirect reference to Bhāsa in Bharata *Nāṭyaśāstra* (XVI. 127) where the latter criticizes the use of ungrammatical forms in dramatic compositions.

चेक्रीडितप्रभृतिभिर्विकृतैश्च शब्दै-
र्युक्ता न भान्ति लक्षिता भरतप्रयोगाः।
यज्ञक्रियेव रुरुचर्मधरैर्धृताकै-
र्वेश्या द्विजैरिव कमण्डलुदण्डहस्तैः॥

(Nāṭyaśāstra, XVI. 127, p. 346, GOS No. 68).

चेक्रीडित has been given as an instance of such a solecism and a similar word is found in the *Avi* (III. 18). So it may safely be concluded that Bharata had Bhāsa's works, which abound in other grammatical mistakes, in mind when writing the stanza.

The use of the word *Bharatavākya* in the MSS of these plays need not speak of their posteriority to Bharata, for "it is a matter of grave doubt whether the stanza was designated by the author as *Bharatavākya* or as *Praśasti*."[1] Most probably the term has been used by some later scribes who took liberties with the texts to bring them into line with all other dramatic compositions of a later age. Abhinavagupta (on Bharata *Nāṭyaśāstra* XIX. 95), Śāradātanaya, and Rāmacandra do not mention *Bharatavākya* but speak of praśasti, which also shows that *Bharatavākya* was meant only as a stage direction, and its use in the MSS does not necessarily indicate a later period than Bharata.[2]

Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* is the oldest extant text-book on dramaturgy; but we have indicated above that Bhāsa is to be placed before it; and also that he is credited with having himself composed a *Nāṭyaśāstra*.[3] In the present state of our knowledge, however, it is not possible to say what the books were that Bhāsa followed either in writing his plays or his alleged *Nāṭyaśāstra*. One of

1 Mankad, *IHQ*, 7, pp. 187-190; at p. 187. 2 Mankad, *IHQ*, 7, pp. 187-190; also the articles on 'Bharata Vākya' in the Indian Historical Quarterly by Mankad (Vol. 1 pp. 187-190), C. Chakravarti (Vol. 7, pp. 190-191; Vol. 5, pp. 549-552); V. Jha (Vol. 6 pp. 175-178); M. Ghosa (Vol. 6, pp. 485-486).
3 Cf. Banerji Sastri, *JRAS*, 1921, p. 371; also Keith, *SD*, p. 105.

the *Nāṭyaśāstras* prior to Bharata, the one written by Bhāsa himself, and perhaps an earlier recension of the extant Bharata *Nāṭyaśāstra*, are the only possible works on dramaturgy, any one of which may have been followed by Bhāsa for writing his dramas.

10. THE TRAGIC SENSE IN BHĀSA

It is not unoften that we read of a charge levelled against the Indian literature that absence of any effort at tragedy is its striking characteristic and the absence is sought to be explained by reference to "the mental outlook of the Indian people and their philosophy of life".[1] The discovery of Bhāsa's works has established at least a *prima facie* case to dislodge the charge, and in spite of Dr. Keith's view that the dramas depict the victory of Kṛṣṇa, and that there is absolutely nothing tragic, there are scholars both Eastern and Western who recognize 'real tragedies' in Bhāsa.[2]

"*Ūrubhaṅga* is a tragedy, viewed from Aristotle's point or that of Hegel".[3] According to Aristotle, the proper subject for a tragedy is the spectacle of a man, an ordinary human being not absolutely good or wise, who is brought to disaster by some frailty in him; it evokes feelings of fear and compassion and thereby purges the soul. Shakespeare's tragedies conform to the view, and Dr. Chambers has classified Shakespeare's tragedies as external, psychological and cosmic. The conflict of a monster with a pigmy or that of a righteous man with an evil-doer will produce a sense of pathos, rather than the tragic sense. From a psychological point, therefore, Hegel's view that tragedy arises not from the conflict of right and wrong but from the conflict of right with right appears more telling. In a conflict of right with wrong, our sympathies are naturally always with the former, and the fate of the latter evokes in us a feeling that he was rightly served,—a feeling quite different from the tragic one.

Viewed in this light, we find that the *Ūrubhaṅga*,

---

1 Keith, *SD*, p. 354; Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer, *ADC*, p. 124; K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, *ADC*, pp. 20-21. 2 *SD*, pp. 38, 96, 106, 276, 354. Contra—Saunders, *JAOS*, 41, p. 152; Meerwarth, *JASB*, 13, pp. 274-275; Sarup, *HB*, 1927 p. 212; Winternitz, *Problems*, p. 111; Venkateshwar, *PB*, 1931 p. 477-478; M. Ramchandra Rao, *OC*, VIII, Summaries, p. 33; Lüders and Lindenau criticised by Keith, *SD*, p. 38 n2. 3 *JBU*, 2, p. 184; also *BBRI*, 5, p. 5. I was really glad to see that Dr. Winternitz quoted the sentence from my article

at least, is a real tragedy, though Meerwarth would include the *Dgh* and *Dv* in addition, under a 'Tragical Trilogy'.[1] The latter two cannot be called tragedies; though we cannot go so far as to say, as Dr. Winternitz does, that they are by a different author.[2] It is not that Duryodhana is depicted as an evil man in the *Ūru*. In all his dramas, Bhāsa shows a soft corner for the fallen heroes and especially he has painted Duryodhana as a real hero, quite distinct from what we read about him in the *Mbh*. His spirited reply to Kṛṣṇa as a messenger would serve as the guiding principle for all times.[3] Duryodhana is depicted what a noble king ought to be like. Throughout in the *Ūru* we find that the poet is always sympathizing with his hero, who is certainly Duryodhana, and he pictures the conflict as of right with right, and that it was not only inevitable but necessary in the ends of justice.

Bhīma's victory over Duryodhana in the *gadāyuddha* is due to the wiles of Kṛṣṇa and we find that Duryodhana fights righteously and that he was more adept in the club-fight than Bhīma.[4] Next, Duryodhana evokes our sympathy, when he, with his broken thighs restrains Balarāma who, in righteous indignation sets up to uproot the Pāṇḍavas. Let the Pāṇḍavas remain, says he, to offer us oblations.[5] He gets shocks one after another when he hears the queens lament (**बन्धमापि स्त्रियो रुदन्ति** । p. 101), when the broken thighs prevent him from prostrating at his father's feet, and when he has to refuse his thigh for a seat to his son.[6] The poet has portrayed Duryodhana as a dutiful son, loving husband, affectionate father, and a noble warrior. Though fallen, he is not crest-fallen, sees nothing to repent and feels proud of the fact that he did not show his back in war (**न पराङ्मुखो युधि इतः** । st. 55). His final advice to Durjaya (p. 109. **अहमिव पाण्डवाः शुश्रूषयितव्याः** ।) shows us that in his fall he finds purification. He reaches a higher plane of morality. His soul is chastened and subdued and cherishes the thought of peace and

1 *JASB*, 13, p. 274. 2 *JBRI*, 5, p. 6. In the next chapter we have refuted Prof. M. Ramachandra Rao's view about the *Karṇa* and the *Veṇī* being tragedies. We could not include the discussion here as we got the article from the learned Professor rather late. 3 59 *Dv*. St. 24: **राज्यं नाम नृपात्मजैः सहृदयैः** etc. 4 *Ūru*. p. 94: **स्वमृगमभिहत्य कामपि संध्यां प्रयच्छति जनार्दनः** । st. 19; **संशिक्षितो नरपतिर्बलवांस्तु भीमः** । 5 *Ūru*, st. 31: **जीवन्तु ते कुरुकुलस्य निवापभोक्तारः** । 6 *Ūru*, pp. 103-105.

forgiveness which had been unknown to him before".[1] Duryodhana rouses our sense of pity by undeserved misfortunes and terror. He is certainly a great man, a hero, at least as Bhāsa shows him. The scene between the father and the son is very touching.[2]

The tragic element in the *Ūru* would be seen in a clearer light by its comparison with Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa's *Veṇisaṁhāra*. Both deal with the fall of Duryodhana. In the latter, Duryodhana is depicted as a man of pleasure, and Bhīma is the real hero. Duryodhana in the *Veṇī* does not attract the sympathies of the spectators, while in the *Ūru* he is the true hero, and his end is 'tragic'. Dr. Keith's criticism may well be directed against the *Veṇī*, where Duryodhana is the enemy of Kṛṣṇa deserving his fate, evoking no sympathy, and the spectators, all worshippers of Kṛṣṇa, enjoy the scene. It is a suppressed tragedy.[3]

Dr. Weller shows that the *Ūru* is not a tragedy from the Hindu outlook; but he goes too far, we think, when he says that the play has a happy end.[4] The different situations detailed above through which Duryodhana passes create an impression of tragedy even in the minds of Hindu spectators. Was it not his misfortune that such a mighty Emperor that Duryodhana was, had to pass through such trials, and is not the misfortune undeserved for such a noble hero?

Dr. Sukthankar says that the *Ūru* is not a tragedy in one act, but "the only surviving intermediate act of an epic drama", because the play has no epilogue, and that a similar play has been called *Dūtaghaṭotkacāṅka*.[5] This is not the necessary conclusion as the piece is complete in itself; there is nothing in it to show its being a part of another work. Further, the epilogue may have slipped out through the scribe's omission, and the variety of the drama to which the scribes assign the particular piece, is not the poet's own writing. '*Aṅka*' may perhaps denote '*Utsṛṣṭikāṅka*', which variety came after Bhāsa. As in the case of *Bharatavākyas* the scribes read their own divisions in these plays. Dr. Winternitz states that "*Ūru* makes far more than any one of the other one-act plays, the

---

1 Meerwarth, *JASB*, 13, p. 275; Sarup, *HR*, 1927, p. 212. 2 *Ūru*, pp. 103-105. 3 cf. *SD*., p. 354. 4 *Ūrubhaṅga, Eine indische Tragedie?* Intr. 5 *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 141.

impression of a poetical work that is complete in itself.'[1] Dr. Sukthankar also finds confirmation for his view in the *Rāmāyaṇa* in twenty one acts and surmises that there might be similarly *Mahābhārata* in a number of acts.[2] But 'the dramatized version of the *Rāmāyaṇa*' is nothing more than the three Rāma dramas, the *Prat*, *Abh*, and *Āścarya*, and as none of the distinct acts of these are available separately, we think that this does not lend its support to the existence of a dramatized version of the *Mahābhārata* saga. We think that all the *Mbh* plays in our group are complete in themselves. The *Ūru* answers wonderfully to the later description of *Utsṛṣṭikāṅka* and it seems that Bhāsa's *Nāṭyaśāstra* also gave a similar, though not exact, definition.

Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* which came to be strictly enforced, at any rate, since the time of Kālidāsa, accounts for the absence of tragedy in later dramas. The rule of happy conclusion was invariably followed in all the plays, and hence we find that many Sanskrit dramas could be changed into real tragedies without altering the psychology of the characters, by changing only the ending.[3]

11. MAGIC IN BHĀSA.

There are various forms in which magic is employed by Sanskrit dramatists for the advancement of the story.[4] In Bhāsa, we have instances of the use of magic by (1) employing objects, materials, or persons endowed with magic power; (2) the curse of a *Ṛṣi* having the desired effect; and (3) the optical illusions of Duryodhana (*Dv*), and Rāma and Sītā (*Prat*).

Instances of the first type are furnished by the *Avi* and *Pratijñā*. In the *Avi*, a magic ring given by a Vidyādhara to the hero is employed which, when worn on the right finger, has the power of making the wearer as also the other person touching him invisible to the public though he remained the same in bodily form.[5] The ring when put on the left finger took off the magical effects from him and rendered the wearer his usual self and visible to the world. This magical ring helps the hero to gain access to the otherwise impenetrable Kanyāntaḥpura

1 *BRRI*, 5, p. 6. 2 *JBBRAS*, 1925, p. 141. 3 Cf. Saunders, *JAOS*, 41, pp. 152-156. 4 Cf. Saunders, *JAOS*, 45, pp. 110-114. 5 *Avi*, Act IV, pp. 64-65. It is not that the ring makes the wearer invisible to all but his beloved, as said by Saunders; *JAOS*, 45, p. 110.

even in broad daylight, infusing new hope and life in the otherwise disappointed hero, who was prepared to commit suicide.

Towards the close of the first act in *Pratijñā*, a servant brings 'a madman's apparel' to Yaugandharāyaṇa saying that Vyāsa had appeared at the festival in the guise of a madman and had left the clothes there. Yaugandharāyaṇa dons the same clothes and finds himself quite transformed, outwardly of course, into a madman. The clothes thus help him to work in Ujjayinī for the release of his master, without disclosing his identity.

Something of the kind is supplied by the *Mv*, where Ghaṭotkaca requires water to sip for chanting *mantras* to effect the magic charm to bind Bhīma, and waters flow to him from the mountains through magic. Bhīma also requires water to chant *mantras* for counteracting the charm of Ghaṭotkaca, but in his case the Brahmin youth supplies him with water and hence no recourse was to be had to magic.[1]

The *Avi* supplies us with another instance of magic of a different kind. The curse of Caṇḍakauśika puts the whole Sauvīra family into Cāṇḍala-hood for over a year; and they have to pass that period incognito in the outskirts of the capital of another prince. It is on account of this curse that the king of Vairantya does not know the real identity of the cāṇḍāla youth and cannot thus think of marrying his daughter to him. Many obstacles come in the way of the lovers owing to the curse.[2]

The *Dv* presents an instance of magic of another type. When Duryodhana seeks to bind Vāsudeva, the latter is seen everywhere, appearing in a moment, vanishing in the next and assuming various forms. Duryodhana is confused and his confusion makes it easy for Vāsudeva to effect his exit.[3]

In the *Prat*, Rāvaṇa appears before Rāma in the guise of a Brahmin through his *māyā*. Further, after his conversation with Rāma and Sītā, a thundering noise is heard and blinding lightning is seen, which also are due to Rāvaṇa's magic.[4]

---

1 *Mv*, pp. 84-86. 2 *Avi*, pp. 95-97. 3 *Dv*, p. 23. 4 *Prat*, pp. 97-98; 102-103; VI, 15.

The *Dv* and *Bāl* present the various weapons of Kṛṣṇa in human garb; and the *Bāl*, some abstract conceptions as *Śāpa*, *Cāṇḍāla-yuvatis*, etc.[1] But these belong more to the domain of popular beliefs and do not help in the development of the plot and hence they are not considered here. It may, however, be safely assumed that Bhāsa's dramas are the earliest instances of the employment of magic in Sanskrit drama.

12. BHĀSA'S STAGE.

Sanskrit dramas were performed in temples on the occasion of festivities, or in the music halls of royal palaces at the times of coronations, marriages, celebrations of victories or similar occasions of special rejoicing, or in cave temples on the slopes of mountains, or even in the open space on the bank of a river, etc. It is contended that there were no special theatres in ancient India and that the idea is taken over from the Greeks. Dr. Keith controverts the theory that recognizes Hellenic influence on Indian theatres and stage management, but postulates the existence of 'the temporary play-houses' in India without adducing any grounds in support.[2]

'The Indian Theatre' is of indigenous origin, since its existence can be shown before the Greek intercourse, and also because there are many significant differences between the Greek theatre and the Indian one, *e.g.*, in the Greek theatres there was very little of woodwork, and the stage was narrower while the auditorium was more extensive and capacious.[3]

We have no particular information as to the kind of theatres in which Bhāsa's dramas were staged, but it seems safe to hold that they were similar to those described in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* and hence we shall first give a short descriptive account of the theatre as given in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*.[4]

The *Nāṭyaśāstra* deals in detail with the laying out and building of *Prekṣāgṛhas* or theatres, which were of three kinds, *viz.*; *Vikṛṣṭa*, the oblong one ('circular'

1 *Dv*, pp. 24-29; *Bāl*, pp. 16-17; Act II. 2 *SD*, pp. 56-57, at p. 57. 3 Kotkar, *Bhāratīya Nāṭya Śāstra*, pp. 22-27. 4 Dr. Acharya has brought to bear his vast and accurate knowledge of Indian Architecture in his recent articles on "The Playhouse of the Hindu period" (*MR*, April, 1936, pp. 370-378) and in addition to the information supplied by the *Nāṭyaśāstra* we have made use of the article wherever necessary.

according to Dr. Acharya); *Caturasra*, the square one; and *Tryasra*, the triangular one: each being subdivided into the spacious *(jyeṣṭha)*, medium *(madhyama)*, and small *(kaniṣṭha)*. These theatres were divided into three parts, the two at the extreme ends being *Nepathyabhūmi* (green-room) and *Prekṣāgṛha* (auditorium), the middle one forming the stage proper, which was again subdivided into *Raṅgaśirṣa* and *Raṅgapīṭha*.

Nepathyagṛha was the rear room where the decorations were kept and the actors attired themselves keeping ready for entering the stage, and it was hereinto that they retired after playing their part on the stage. It contained the dressing and resting rooms for the actors.

Raṅgaśirṣa, the back stage ('stage front' according to Dr. Acharya) was just in front of the green-room and was separated from the latter by a wall having two doors. It had six pillars and it was on a slightly higher level than *Raṅgapīṭha*, the front stage ('stage proper' according to Dr. Acharya). On the two sides of the front stage *(Raṅgapīṭha)* over the four pillars were erected minarets (*Mattavāraṇi*, 'entablature' according to Dr. Acharya). The front stage was used to represent an open space or street; the back stage represented a room in a palace or house or any interior. There was also an 'upper stage or balcony' constructed on the pillars to the sides of *Raṅgaśirṣa* and *Nepathyabhūmi*, which was used for walls of palaces or elevated spots from which the actors gesticulated descending or ascending (आरोहणं or अवरोहणं नाटयति।).

Kakṣyā, movable curtain, was employed for showing a change of scene, and more frequently for the *parikramaṇa* of any actor.[1] We shall deal with this later on while discussing the actual staging of the third act of the *Avi*. There were used transverse curtains also, at occasions whose existence is denied by Dr. Keith,[2] but without assuming their existence many interesting scenes in Sanskrit plays would be quite inexplicable. To say that there was no such thing as a transverse curtain would be to charge the dramatists with having no

1 The word 'kakṣyā' is not explained in Bharata. Abhinavagupta gives its meaning as निष्क्रमणप्रवेशगमनागमनोपयोगी स्थानविभागः। (*Nāṭyaśāstra*, Vol. II., GOS No. 48, p. 197; XIII. 3 Com). Thus it would appear that the kakṣyās were useful for the entries, exits, movements, etc. of the actors. 2 SD, pp. 113 n1; 359, also n3.

imaginative faculty and the spectators with having no sense at all. The speeches of the actors, actully seeing one another but pretending not to be visible throughout a scene would be ridiculous on the face of them unless a curtain intervenes between them. The following are a few of the scenes in our plays, which clearly show that transverse curtains were indispensable for their representation: *Avi*, pp. 18-23; 47-48; *Pratijñā*, Act IV, pp. 78-79; Act V, pp. 97-98; *Svapna*, Act, IV; *Cār*, Act III; etc.

Perhaps the whole of our statement as to the curtains, *kakṣyās* etc. would be held untenable on account of the *prima facie* objection we have to meet that the ancient Hindu theatre had no curtains and that the idea has been borrowed from the Greeks. Dr. Keith has ably answered the contention by pointing out the absence of curtains in the Attic theatres, but he says that the word '*yavanikā*' which is the Sanskrit word for 'curtain' is made up from 'Yavana', *i.e.*, Western foreigners such as Egyptians, Greeks, etc., signifying thereby that the piece of cloth used for curtains was of foreign manufacture.[1] We think, like Miss Ketkar, that the latter is a far-fetched interpretation and that the word *yavanikā* is a corrupt form of the original 'Javanika' that was used to denote 'curtains'.[2] Once it is established that the Indian theatres used curtains it naturally follows that many such were used.

The auditorium *(Prekṣāgṛha)* had a door at the extreme end to the east for the spectators to enter. The seating arrangement began at a distance of twelve cubits from the inner stage, or four cubits from the front stage. The ground was gradually raised till at the door it equalled the height of the *Raṅgapitha*, *viz.*, one and half cubits.[3] Thus each one of the spectators had an unobstructed view of the stage. The seats were of wood or of brick arranged in rows. Seats that were close to the stage were reserved for the *Prāśnikas* or *Siddhilekhakas* who used to evaluate the staging of a drama according to the various standards laid down in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*.

1 SD, p. 61. 2 *Bhāratiya Nāṭyaśāstra*. Poona, pp. 37-39. 3 Cf. *Nāṭyaśāstra*, II 84, Com: द्वे द्वे भूमी यत्र निम्नाते (निम्नोन्नते) ततोऽप्युक्ता इति निष्क्रमण (निम्नोन्नतक्रमेण) रङ्गपीठनिकटात्प्रभृति द्वारपर्यन्तं यावद्रङ्गपीठोत्सेधतुल्योत्सेधो भवति। एवं हि परस्परानाच्छादने सामाजिकानाम्। (Vol. I, GOS No. 36, p. 66).

The *Nāṭyaśāstra* mentions four principal times for the performance of plays: in the morning, evening, and during the first or last quarter of the night. The time depended mainly on the theme of the particular piece, *e.g.*, religious plays were performed in the morning, erotic during the first quarter of the night, pathetic during the last quarter and so on. Time was changed according to the circumstances. There were rules as to the period within which the drama ought to be performed and this counted as a factor in adjudicating on the merits of the plays.

Coming next to the actors, we find that female rôles were played by females in general, but in particular instances m a l e s also personated female characters. Elaborate rules are given as to the selection of particular persons for particular rôles such as gods, demons, kings, servants, etc.

There is a difference of opinion as to the accessories of the stage. Prof. Wilson says that chariots, horses, etc., were actually brought on the stage, while Dr. Keith holds that such accessories were quite limited and had to be supplied either by imagination, description, or gesticulation of the actors. "Thus", says Dr. Keith, "though the car of Duṣyanta might have been represented on the stage, the horses would be left to the imagination and the speed of the chariot indicated by the gesticulations of the charioteer".[1] Miss Ketkar after an exhaustive consideration of the stage directions in the *Śākuntala* and *Mṛcch* rightly concludes that there was much of a movable scenery such as chariot, horses, elephants, aerial chariots, etc., made from some light material. Kauṭilya's evidence is further adduced to show the progress of Indian sculpture and handicrafts in the pre-Mauryan period.[2]

Now we come to some particular scenes in the plays and see how they would have been enacted on the stage. In the third act of the *Avi* is a big monologue requiring the use of the front and back stage as also of the gallery and transverse curtains and *kakṣyās* (movable curtains towards the sides).

The first part of the act (pp. 34-42) is enacted in the back stage where there are some occasions for the use

1 *SD*, pp. 364-368. 2 *Bhāratiya Nāṭyaśāstra*, Poona, pp. 166-177.

of *kakṣyās* for *paribhramaṇa*, and towards the close, the princess and her maids appear on the balcony where the princess is shown as resting and the maids serving her. It is then that Avimāraka comes on the front stage through one of the entrances at either end, let us say, from the north. He is represented as passing through the streets of the city at night. He begins his journey gradually towards the south on the *Raṅgapīṭha* and hears some music by the side, to which he pays close attention (कर्णं दत्त्वा) and turns to another side, which may be represented on the stage by putting a movable curtain in his way. Again after turning aside twice, he stands at one end (एकान्ते स्थितः) to avoid a thief who is seen walking on the stage at that time. Then he starts on his further journey but turning across (परिक्रम्य) the guards are seen to pass, say from south to north, at which Avimāraka enters the gambling house (विलंब्य स्थित्वा) which may be shown by some temporarily elevated spot. Then he comes to the palace in the inner stage *(Raṅgaśīrṣa)*, which he enters, presumably by the south end. There are pillars on the sides of the *Raṅgaśīrṣa*, and let us suppose, a temporary wall from east to west is raised on the south end of the *Raṅgaśīrṣa* (so that there should be no obstruction to spectators seeing everything in his actions). Then after chanting *mantras* he throws the rope which becomes fixed to the supporting beams of the wall and by that rope he ascends and again descends the palace wall; and throws away the rope (प्रक्षिपति) and passes through the palace which is *Raṅgaśīrṣa* (inner stage). Going a little further, he comes across a staircase and ascends the *Kanyāpura prāsāda* (*i.e.*, the elevated stage or balcony), which is already occupied by the princess, but between him and the princess there is a door, a transverse partition, which he opens by the magic key (उद्घाट्य) and comes to the spot where we had left the princess to rest.

The third act in the *Cār* also would be similarly staged. After the singing festival the hero and Vidūṣaka walk on the front stage and enter their house situated somewhere in the back stage and the latter sleeps in a room, presumably a part of the stage, covered on all sides save one that is open to the audience. There were thus transverse curtains to represent two walls on the sides. The thief then enters the back stage and through his scientific

knowledge bores a hole in the wall, apparently a wooden or brick partition, and takes the ornaments from Vidūṣaka's hands after entering the room. Before his entry, both Sajjalaka and Vidūṣaka are visible to the audience but not to one another owing to the wall that intervenes, obviously a transverse curtain. After the exit of the thief, the maid, Cārudatta and others enter the particular room from the inner apartment.

The fourth act of the *Cār* where Vasantasenā overhears the conversation between Sajjalaka and Madanikā not seen by them, the trio being visible to the audience, is so obvious an illustration of the transverse curtain that no comments are necessary.

Next we come to the fourth act of the *Svapna* where the scene is laid out in the *Pramadavana* under the *Śephālikā* bower, which may possibly be some part of the front stage. There they collect some flowers. The *Mādhavilatāmaṇḍapa* is behind this in the back stage and the entrance to it is through some creeper which may be shown by means of actual bowers and creepers being supported on wooden frames. The king with the jester next enters the stage and comes in the direction of the *Śephālikā* bower and the stone seat on which Padmāvatī with her friends is resting. Seeing the king approaching, the princess makes her exit, and enters the *Mādhavilatā* bower. The king next sits on the same seat and infers that some lady must have just gone away on account of पादाक्रान्तानि पुष्पाणि etc. But to the jester the heat is unbearable and he proposes entering Mādhavilatā bower and they set out in that direction. The maidservant obstructs their entry by troubling the bees resting over the bower. Thereupon both the king and the jester sit outside on the other part of the stage, and then the conversation about Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī begins, to which both offer their comments, 'aside' and among themselves. When towards the close, the king's face is full of tears and Padmāvatī nears him, Vidūṣaka having gone to fetch water, both Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī's maid leave the stage by the way they came, apparently unseen by the king, his eyes being closed.

The fifth act of the *Bāl* shows us the use of the gallery or the upper stage where the king is seated and

watches everything from there. The fight between Cāṇūra, Muṣṭika, Dāmodara and Saṅkarṣaṇa takes place on the front stage and after killing Cāṇūra, Dāmodara ascends the prāsāda and kills Kaṁsa. The remaining action of the scene in which Vasudeva, Ugrasena and Nārada make their entry takes place on the stage below, though there is no specific direction to that effect.

The fourth act of the *Prat* also supplies us with the use of the inner stage, balcony and transverse curtains. Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā are staying in an *Āśrama*, apparently the upper stage on the *Raṅgaśirṣa*; Sumantra and Bharata see it from below and the latter announces himself. Hearing his voice, Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa appear on the stage in the upper gallery. Rāma sends Lakṣmaṇa to see who had called and the latter comes down on the stage below through the door of the transverse curtain and after *parikramaṇa* sees and recognizes Bharata and Sumatra. His arrival is then told to Rāma who sends Sītā to welcome Bharata. Their conference takes place in the inner stage, after the close of which Bharata comes forward to the front stage, ascends the chariot and Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa see him off to the door of their Āśrama.

The above would, it is hoped, present a fair idea of the views we hold, and the idea we have of Bhāsa's stage.

13. METRICS.[1]

Our poet's command of Sanskrit is evident from the variety of metres he employs. There are twenty-three different metres, and the total number of verses is 1092. The *Prat* comes first in using the largest number of verses, *viz.*, 157, and also 15 different kinds of metres. The *Abh* is a close second with 154 and 14 respectively. It is remarkable that even in plays with a total of 50 to 60 verses, nearly ten different metres are used. The *Karṇa* is the shortest play, with only 25 verses, but 7 different metres are used.

There are thirteen Prakrit verses in these plays in six different metres, the predominant being the *Āryā* with five verses.

Coming to the individual plays, we find that there

1 We have liberally drawn on the data furnished by Dr. Sukthankar in his "*Studies in Bhāsa*, II" in *JAOS*, 41, pp. 107-130; and Dr. Keith in *SD*, pp. 123-124. We have drawn our own inferences from the material.

is a general preference for the *śloka* in tune with the large proportion the verses in that metre bear with the grand total, *viz.* nearly forty per cent. The *Mv* has the highest percentage in this connection using 64·5 per cent *ślokas*. The *Pañc* is next with 50 per cent and has the largest number of *ślokas* in this group. The remaining plays excepting the *Avi*, *Karṇa* and *Ūru* bear a fair relation with the general proportion of *śloka* to the total, their percentage varying between 31 per cent (*Cār*) and 48 per cent (*Prat*). The *Avi* comes with the smallest proportion, *viz.* 15·5, and the *Karṇa* and *Ūru* have 16 and 18 respectively; the smallest number being found in the *Karṇa*. As regards the other metres, the *Abh* claims nearly 40 per cent of the verses in the *Puṣpitāgrā*, the *Pañc* nearly a third of the total number in the *Vaṅśastha* and *Śikhariṇi*. The *Ūru* contains the largest number of verses in the *Śārdūlavikrīḍita*, *viz.* 21 being 32 per cent of the total number of verses in that play. Nearly 25 per cent each of the verses in the *Avi* are in the *Vasantatilakā* (27) and *Upajāti* (23) metres, and their number is the largest for any individual play in the group. Of the sparsely used metres, the *Svapna* and *Bāl* contain 3 each of the *Āryā*, that is, nearly 27 per cent of the total, the *Prat* has four verses in the *Hariṇī*, that is 50 per cent, and the *Avi*, 3 in the *Sragdharā*, that is, 37 per cent. Illustrations of the *Vaiśvadevī* are found only in the *Svapna*, *Pratijñā*, and *Abh*, the last of which furnishes the solitary instances of the *Drutavilambita* and *Bhujaṅgaprayāta*. The single verses that occur in the *Pṛthvi* and *Daṇḍaka* are to be seen in the *Avi* and the *Suvadanā* is found in the *Pañc*, *Dv* and *Prat*.

Coming now to the consideration of individual metres, the main thing that strikes us as a unique feature of the versification of this group is, as already noted, the preponderance of the *śloka*. It is also noted that the high proportion is not confined to the epic dramas only. The lowest proportion is represented by the *Avi*, *Karna* and *Ūru* where it lingers between 15·5 per cent and 18 per cent. But in dramas of the classical period, we find that the proportion of the *śloka* dwindles down to nearly the same percentage and a special favour is shown for the *Aryā* or some of the fixed syllabic metres, particularly the *Vasantatilakā* or *Śārdūlavikrīḍita*. The *śloka* in

classical dramatists is used on a small scale, in Kālidāsa it being nearly 16 per cent, in Viśākhadatta 13 per cent, in Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa and Śūdraka nearly 25 per cent. Bhavabhūti shows nearly a third in his *Uttararāmacarita* and Mahāviracarita, but he comes down to nearly 7 per cent in the *Mālatī-Mādhava*. Thus this preference for the *śloka* displayed by our group places it on quite a distinct level from the dramas of the classical age so far as metres are concerned. The *śloka* is invariably perfect. The rule as to the di-iambus in the second *pāda* is insisted on regularly; as compared with the observance of this rule the number of weak endings is rather high. However, the construction may be said to be remarkably regular comparing favourably in that respect with the epic *śloka*. The proportion of lapses in Kālidāsa and Aśvaghoṣa is more than that found in Bhāsa. Prof. Dhruva has enunciated a principle about arriving at the chronology of different works on the basis of the regularity or looseness of the *śloka* and the employment of particular metres in a particular period.[1] We agree with his conclusions with regard to the priority of Bhāsa and Kālidāsa to Aśvaghoṣa, and of Bhāsa to Kālidāsa. But the rule as to the proportion of poetic licences and weak endings is neither infallible nor of mathematical accuracy. It is helpful only if it confirms the conclusions reached from other evidences. Another confirmation for the above hypothesis showing priority of Bhāsa to the classical period may be found in the rare use of the *Āryā* metre, which became popular in the classical period. This metre is found employed in only one per cent of the total number of verses by our poet, while in Kālidāsa the proportion rises to 36 per cent in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*.

Next to the *śloka*, *Vasantatilakā* and *Upajāti* are the favourite metres of the author. There are 179 verses in the *Vasantatilakā* and 121 in the *Upajāti*. Kālidāsa, Viśākhadatta and Harṣa employ the *Vasantatilakā* in a greater proportion. Both *Vasantatilakā* and *Upajāti* occur in all the plays, and so does the *Śārdūlavikrīḍita* with a total of 92. The *Mālinī* (72) is fairly distributed in all the plays except the *Svapna*, and the *Vaṁśastha*

---

1 *Parākramaṅkā Prasādi*, 1923, Intr., pp. 22-25; *Thakkar Lectures*, pp. 116-148; 197-253. Dr. Keith states that the sparing use of the irregular forms is due to the comparatively small number of slokas used consecutively: *SD*, p. 123.

(35) also excludes the *Svapna* from its fold. The *Puṣpitāgrā* with its 55 verses is not to be found in the *Dgh*, *Karṇa* and *Ūru*. The *Śālinī* (22), *Śikhariṇī* (19), and *Praharṣiṇī* (17) come next in order, occurring in more than 7 plays of the group. The *Āryā* (11) is found in five plays. Other metres are purely sporadic. The *Hariṇī* (8) places half its number in the *Prat*. The *Daṇḍaka* (1) and its short form are found once each in the *Avi* and *Prat* respectively. The *Vaitāliya* (1) is found in the *Pratijñā* as also the 'Undetermined Prakrit metre'.[1]

With regard to the structure of the verses, it should be noted that the rules of prosody are strictly observed. The style is notably simple and vigorous. Long and complicated compounds are generally absent and words and phrases are chosen with due regard to the position of the caesura, which falls at the end of a complete word. The *pādas* are generally complete and independent in sense; but at times they are connected with the rest of the verse. The *Ślokas* show great fondness for epic tags such as अचिरेणैव कालेन, प्रसादं कर्तुमर्हसि, कम्पयन्निव मेदिनीम्, सम्भ्रमोत्फुल्ल-लोचना, etc., and also conventional comparisons. The frequent breaking up of a verse between different speakers or by interruption of one kind or other, as already observed in an earlier chapter, is a speciality of Bhāsa. Metrical solecisms can be defended on the ground of epic usage, very few being really worth the name. Of them some may be explained away as due to the special liking of the poet.

14. BHĀSA'S INFLUENCE.

Bhāsa has been a constant source of inspiration to all later dramatists for a very long period till his dramas went out of public currency. Śūdraka planned his whole work on the *Cār*, bodily taking not only the plot, characters and incidents, but the wording as well, making

---

1 In accordance with Dr. Sukthankar's suggestion to refer to the new edition of "*Chandoracanā*" by Prof. M. T. Patvardhan to find out what the learned Marathi scholar has to say with regard to the 'Undetermined Prakrit Metre' in the *Pratijñā* (IV. 2), I consulted the book. 'Abbreviations' and 'Index' showing no reference to Bhāsa's *Pratijñā*, I had to go through the whole work. There does not seem to be any direct and definite reference to the Prakrit stanza. The stanza appears to be the combination of 'Ananda' (*Chandoracanā* p. 290) *i. e.* ⏑–⏑–⏑–– and 'Suvarnaruciri' (*Chandoracanā*, pp. 134, 190) *i. e.* ⏑–⏑–⏑–––. It is, however, slightly irregular in the last five syllables of the second line, which occur as: ⏑–⏑–– instead of. ⏑–⏑–.

improvements and removing the crudities wherever necessary, and adding something to the original work for the purpose of making a popular appeal. We have dealt in detail in a separate chapter with the relationship of Bhāsa's *Cārudatta* and Śūdraka's *Mṛcchakaṭika* from all aspects of the problem.

In saying that Kālidāsa has taken ideas from Bhāsa we do not intend to detract from the merits of the Prince among Sanskrit dramatists. Kālidāsa seems to be such a close student of Bhāsa, that knowingly or unknowingly, there appear in his plays many ideas and conceptions from Bhāsa; but he presents them in quite a different garb stamping his individuality on them and thus changing their whole outlook. Dr. S. Krishnaswami Iyengar, in his Presidential Address at the Mysore Oriental Conference, has rightly sounded a note of warning as to the necessity and desirability of changing the whole outlook of the matter as to the relationship and nature of indebtedness from stray quotations from different works.[1] Some striking instances of parallelisms between Bhāsa and Kālidāsa from among a number of others which appeal to us as showing the relationship and the nature of indebtedness between the two dramatists have been given in an appendix; they may be taken for what they are worth. To us, of course, they convey the impression that Bhāsa is the source.

Various incidents from the *Prat* (*valkala* incident, the watering of plants, etc.), poetic imageries from the *Svapna*, and the erotic element from the *Avi* are to be seen united admirably in the *Śākuntala*. The *tapovana* scene in the *Svapna* as well as that between Kuraṅgī, Nalinikā and Magadhikā in the *Avi* are the prototypes of the similar scenes in the *Śākuntala* in Acts I and III and of the *Vikrama*. The incidents and verbal similarities between *Śākuntala*, Act III, and *Avi*, Act III as well as the changed order of genealogy in the *Raghuvaṁśa* on the model of the *Prat*, show Bhāsa's influence on Kālidāsa.

The *Avi* seems to have supplied Bhavabhūti with many incidents and ideas for his *Mālatī-Mādhava*. In both, the plot is taken from folklore and the sameness of style is evident in their descriptions of nature. The

1 p. 29. Presidential Address at the Eighth All India Oriental Conference held at Mysore.

elephant incident in the *Avi* has been instrumental in suggesting the tiger incident in the *Mālati-Mādhava* and the saving of the life of the hero in the *Avi* at the hands of Vidyādhara finds its parallel in the saving of Mādhava through Yoginī's advice. *Daṇḍaka*, a metre rare in classical literature is used by Bhavabhūti, doubtless through the influence of the *Avi*. In the *Mahāvīra-Carita*, which has a large number of characters, the demons, spirits, etc., and their attendants, speak like human beings, which may be due to similar devices in the *Abh*, *Bāl* etc. The picture scroll from the *Svapna* has been employed in the *Uttararāmacarita*. The politico-historical drama *Mudrārākṣasa* shows the influence of the *Pratijñā*. Cāṇakya reveals features like Yaugandharāyaṇa. The pathetic scene between Candanadāsa and his son is modelled upon similar scenes in the *Ūru* and the undiscovered sequel of the *Cār* (on which the scene in the *Mṛcch* is based).

The *Priyadarśikā*, *Ratnāvalī* and *Nāgānanda* show a considerable influence of Bhāsa; and Prof. Paranjape, following the spurious verses of Rājaśekhara, tried to prove the above trio to be from Bhāsa.[1] This is certain, at any rate, that Bhāsa has been much drawn upon. The first two are based on the famous Udayana legend which is also recorded in the *Svapna* and *Pratijñā*. In the *Priyadarśikā* we find that the poet has taken the idea of Agastyapūjā (Act II) from the *Avi*; the well known characteristic of Bhāsa of bringing water on the stage has been copied in the fourth act, but the word '*āpaḥ*' in '*āpas tāvat*' has been changed to '*salilam salilam*'; the jester thereupon at once returns with water (निष्क्रम्य प्रविश्य) which is also another Bhāsa feature. The drama also refers approvingly to playing on lute and music etc., which we find in the *Pratijñā*, *Svapna*, *Avi*, and *Cār*. Similarly, the *Ratnāvalī* and *Nāgānanda* also present many specialities of Bhāsa, at times under a different garb.

The variety and bluntness of characters that we witness in the *Pañc* is met with in the *Veṇīsaṁhāra*. The *Prabodhacandrodaya* shows the culmination of the attempt in the *Bāl* at presenting abstract ideas as characters.

---

1 *Sāhitya Saṅgraha*, 1, pp. 141–186.

The influence of Bhāsa on the Kerala dramatists is immense. Not only have they imitated his structural peculiarities but also they have taken down his antique Prakrit. Mahendravikramavarman and Śaktibhadra, the pioneer dramatists of the South, are specially indebted to the *Abh* and *Pratijñā* of Bhāsa for their *Mattavilāsa* and *Āścarya* respectively. Bhāsa's Udayana plays are responsible for the creation of the *Viṇāvāsavadatta*, *Unmādavāsavadatta*, *Tāpasavatsarāja*, *Vatsarājacarita*, etc. The plays of Kulaśekharavarman, the *Kalyāṇasaugandhika*, *Dāmaka*, *Caturbhāṇi*, *Traivikrama*, *Bhagavadajjukiya* and many other plays from the South have imitated the technique and ideas of Bhāsa.

CHAPTER VI

RELATION BETWEEN CĀRUDATTA AND MṚCCHAKAṬIKA.

The publication of the *Cārudatta* (or *Daridra-Cārudatta*)[1] has thrown an unexpected light on the age of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* which was so long regarded as the oldest of Sanskrit dramas, and has once for all exploded Pischel's theory which after first ascribing it to Bhāsa later fathered it upon Daṇḍin. But the *Cār* instead of solving the problem finally has rendered it more complicated. The two plays furnish an uncommon phenomenon in Sanskrit literature in that they are very closely connected thereby excluding the hypothesis of their independent origin. For the purposes of our present study we are not concerned with the date and authorship of the *Mṛcch.*

AUTHORSHIP OF THE CĀRUDATTA

We have already shown that the *Cār* can be linked along with the other plays in the series to a common author on account of the close resemblances it has with many plays of the group. It has, for example, a similar description of darkness as in the *Avi* and *Bāl* ; it presents the same liking for singing and music as the *Svapna*, *Avi* and *Pratijñā* ; it contains similar solecisms and Prakritisms as the other plays. The author of the *Cār* further pays no attention to the unity of time as is found in the *Abh*, *Avi*, *Bāl*, *Svapna*, etc.[2] It differs from the rest in having no benedictory stanza, nor is there the usual prologue, nor the *Bharatavākya* ; but the absence can be explained on the ground that we have yet to come across

---

1 Cf. Dhruva, *Svapnani Sundari*, Intr., p. 10. 2 See Supra, Chapter IV, *Critical Study* section 'Bhāsa's Defects'.

a complete copy of the *Cār*, though one MS wrongly states : अवसितं चारुदत्तम् ।

CĀRUDATTA : A FRAGMENT.

The next point is to consider whether the *Cār* is incomplete, and whether the remaining acts may be available in future. Dr. Sukthankar, Dr. Belvalkar, Prof. Paranjape and Mr. Mehendale have conclusively proved that the *Cār* is a fragment, and the conclusion follows necessarily from the numerous passages which indicate that the poet wanted to continue the play.[1]

1. Cārudatta (*Cār*, I. 6 ; p. 15) पापं कर्म च यत्परैरपि कृतं तत्तस्य सम्भाव्यते ।
2. Śakāra (A) *Cār*, p. 33, अहके दाव वंचिदे कूडकावडशीलए । गीवहा दुक्खदे कदे ।
   (B) *Cār*, p. 34, ...मा दाव तव अ मम अ दालुणो खोहो होदि त्ति ।
3. Saṁvāhaka p. 57. को हि णाम अप्पणा किदं पत्तुअआरेण विणासेदि ।
   Gaṇikā p. 58. गच्छदु अय्यो पुणो देसन्तरम् ।
4. Sajjalaka (Act IV. 7, p. 102) नरः प्रत्युपकारार्थी विपत्तौ लभते फलम् । द्विषतामेव कालोऽस्तु योऽस्या भवतु तस्य वा ॥
5. Gaṇikā (p. 90) जदा अय्यचारुदत्तो अभिसारइदव्वो तदा मण्डेमित्ति ।
6. Gaṇikā. *Cār*, p. 103. एहि इमं अलङ्कारं गहिअ अय्यचारुदत्तं अभिसरिस्सामो ।
   Ceṭī. *Cār*, p. 103. (अज्जए ! तह) एदं पुण अभिसारि आसहाअभूदं दुहिदं उण्णमिदं ।
7. Cārudatta (Act I. 5, pp. 14-15) भाग्यक्रमेण हि धनानि पुनर्भवन्ति ।
8. *Bharatavākya* is absent, and even towards the close of the last act there are signs of continuation, *viz.* No. 6 above.

Dr. Belvalkar says with regard to 1, 2, 3 and 7 above that dramatic justice requires all these fulfilments.[2] Cārudatta's first statements about poverty are almost prophetic : among other humiliating and insulting

---

1 Sukthankar, *QJMS*, 1918, pp. 181-186 ; Belvalkar, *OC*, I, pp. 189-192 ; Paranjape, *Sāhitya Saṁgraha*, I, pp. 135-140 ; Mehendale, *BCV*, pp. 369-374. 2 *OC*, I, p. 191.

treatments a poor man is subjected to, Cārudatta says that the guilt of another's evil deed is attached to a poor man. Śakāra cannot be said to pour out empty threats; on the contrary his words are significant; nor can he be said to brook the insult from Vasantasenā by the return of his specially sent carriage. Saṁvāhaka seeks an opportunity to repay his obligations. Cārudatta is confident of better days coming to him. Vasantasenā sets out to meet Cārudatta. All these factors clearly and unmistakably show that the writer wanted to continue the play and not to end it abruptly. Dr. Charpentier, however, concludes that one more act would complete the *Cār* and that (1) पापं कर्म च यत्परैरपि कृतं etc. and (3) गच्छतु भव्यो पुणोदंसणाअ । are of a formal character.[1] According to him the original *Cār* had five acts corresponding to the first five acts in the *Mṛcch*. But the cumulative effect of all the above passages, as will be readily seen, is against such an assumption; for the action is not complete even after the fifth act. Mr. Swami perhaps was the first to pronounce the *Cār* as complete in itself, as it is according to him, an abridgment of the first four acts of the *Mṛcch*; and Prof. Pisharoti, Prof. Devdhar, Dr. Macdonell, Dr. Raja and others have accepted the position.[2] Dr. Hirananda Sastri means the same thing though he seems to dismiss with scant courtesy the attempt of Dr. Sukthankar to prove that the *Cār* is a fragment, by the remark "and so it is!"[3] Later on, he qualifies his remarks by saying that the *Cār* is incomplete "as compared with *Mṛcch* of which it is only a part" and concludes that the continuation of the *Cār* will not be found.[4]

In addition to the passages from the work itself, there is some external evidence to support our view that the *Cār* is incomplete and that its sequel may be found.

In the fifth *pariccheda* of the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*, a verse is quoted as an example of the characteristics of Viṭa who is defined as: मान्यः कलत्रवान् सुकविभवो गुणवान् विटः ।.

---

1 *JRAS*, 1923, pp. 600-601. 2 Swami, *IA*, 45, p. 194; Pisharoti, *Criticism*, pp. 32-33; Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, pp. 32-40; Macdonell, *India's Past*, p. 108; Raja, *JOR*, I, pp. 243-245. 3 *MASI*, 28, p. 21, note. 4 *MASI*, 28 p. 24, also note. Mr. Deb, however, takes the *Cār* to be complete, but earlier than the *Mṛcch*, which he places in the Kushan period. *JASB*, 1933, p. 345, n 2.

The verse is said to be addressed by Viṭa to Śakāra, which runs:[1]

शकार ! किं प्रार्थनया प्रावारेण मिषेण वा।
अकार्यवज्रं मे हृदि किमभीष्टं करोमि ते॥

In the whole range of Sanskrit drama Śakāra chiefly appears in the *Cār* and the *Mṛcch*. So we shall have to look up to these as containing the verse at the time the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* was composed. From the sense of the verse and the context in which it is quoted, the verse seems to have been spoken at the occasion of Vasantasenā's murder effected in the eighth act of the *Mṛcch*. But the *Mṛcch* does not contain the verse; it has instead a prose passage (p. 142 विटः—बाढम्। करोमि वज्रयित्वा स्वकार्यम्।). The elements of the verse quoted in the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* seem scattered round about the above passage in the *Mṛcch* (*viz.*, VIII. 32 ...पावालयं...). In view of the fact that the author of the *Mṛcch* has expanded the stray sentences from the *Cār*, or at least from the relation of the passages in the two plays, it seems possible that the verse has been omitted in the *Mṛcch* and its sense only has been given. So it may safely be assumed that the continuation of the *Cār* must have been developed on similar lines as found in the *Mṛcch*, and that the verse is from the second part of the *Cār* which is lost to us.

Dr. Lévi has given the following citation from the *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa* of Sāgaranandin, which has given it as coming from a *Daridra Cārudatta*:

शुष्कद्रुमगतो रौति आदित्याभिमुखं स्थितः।
कथमस्यनिमित्तं मे वायसो ज्ञापयिष्यति॥

The *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa* knows both the *Mṛcch* and the *Cār* and cites from both, and hence it is clear that it distinguishes between the two works. The stanza quoted above does not occur in the *Mṛcch*, but the identical sentiments and many of the phrases occur in the ninth act of the drama in the usually expanded form in the following two stanzas.[2] *Mṛcch*, IX. 10-11. pp. 167-168:

रूक्षस्वरं वाशति वायसोऽयं
ममाग्रमभ्रत्य मुहुराह्वयन्ति।

---

1 Dhruva, *Svapnavāsavadatta*, Intr., p. 91. 2 *JA*, 1923, pp. 216-217; Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, pp. 274-276.

सव्यं च नेत्रं स्फुरति प्रसह्य
ममानिमित्तानि हि खेदयन्ति ॥

शुष्कवृक्षस्थितो ध्वांक्ष आदित्याभिमुखस्तथा ।
मयि चोद्यते वामं चक्षुर्घोरमसंशयम् ॥

This would certainly lead one to style the *Mṛcch* as a "*reprise délayée*', as has been rightly done by Dr. Lévi.[1] Incidentally it may be mentioned that Bhāsa gives expression to similar ill omens in almost identical words in the *Pañc*, (p. 48) which indicates Bhāsa as the originator of these particular enumerations of ill omens.

The conclusion, therefore, is that the *Daridra-Cārudatta* had at least nine acts and the two plays developed to the end on very similar lines.

ACTS V-X OF MṚCCHAKAṬIKA.

Accepting the *Mṛcch* as an independent work having no connection with Bhāsa's *Cār*, the latter acts reveal the influence of Bhāsa, thereby indicating the author's acquaintance with Bhāsa's works.

1. The idea that natural arms are the fittest weapons for Bhīma, a real warrior, is found in the *Mv*, *Bāl* and *Pañc* of Bhāsa. The same idea is found expressed in भीमस्यानुकरिष्यामि बाहुः शस्त्रं भविष्यति । (*Mṛcch*, VI, 17).

2. The wonderful celerity with which the servants bring a news or announce the entry of the person invited, which is indicated by the stage direction (निष्क्रम्य प्रविश्य), has been observed by us as a peculiar technique feature of Bhāsa. This is found repeated in the trial-scene of the *Mṛcch*. Cf. pp. 165, 167.

3. *Mṛcch* IX. 21 occurs in the *Suvadanā* which is an unusual metre in classical Sanskrit drama. We have already shown Bhāsa's liking for unknown metres and this metre in particular. (*Pañc*, I. 6; *Dv*, 15; *Prat*, III. 3, 7, 11).

4. The fifth act of the *Avi* and the fifth act of the *Mṛcch* end in a similar way, the hero entering the inner apartments after thunder and rain.

---

1 *JA*. 1923, p. 217.

5. A split up verse completed by different speakers which is already noted as a special feature of Bhāsa, is found copied in the *Mṛcch*, VII. 7.

6. The inauspicious omens which Cārudatta comes across in the *Mṛcch* (IX. 10-11) are similar to those mentioned in the *Pañc*, p. 48.—किण्णुहु एसो वाआपो पुक्खलुक्खं आलुहिअ पुक्खरास्साहिघट्टिअतुण्डं आदिवाहिमुहं विप्पलं खिलवदि।

7. Similarity of ideas and expression with Bhāsa is found in such sentences as दिट्ठप्पणट्ठा बहुलीभवन्ति। करिकरसमबाहुः। गोउहं लतां कुसुमितां...।

8. The *Bharatavākya* in the *Mṛcch* expresses similar sentiments as are found in the normal epilogue of the Bhāsa dramas.

These facts coupled with those given earlier while considering whether the *Cār* was complete in itself, tend to show that the *Cār* as we have it is a fragment; that it contained at least four more acts which developed on identical lines as found in the *Mṛcch*; and that the later acts of the *Mṛcch*, considered independently, betray Bhāsa influences.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CĀRUDATTA AND MṚCCHAKAṬIKA.

Drs. T. Ganapati Sastri, Sukthankar, Belvalkar, Winternitz, Sten Konow, Keith, Charpentier, Thomas, Morgenstierne, Banerji Sastri, Jolly, Profs. Dhruva, Bhide, Paranjape, Tatke, Messrs. Harihar Sastri, Khuperkar, Kirata and many other oriental scholars maintain the priority of the *Cār* and consider the *Mṛcch* as an enlargement of it; while others like Profs. Kane, K. R. Pisharoti, Devdhar, Ramavatar Sarma, Bhattanatha Swami, R. Raddi, Mr. K. G. Sankar consider the Trivandrum plays as spurious and regard the *Cār* as something little less than a literary forgery. Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, Prof. Jahagirdar, Mr. Nerurkar, and Dr. H. Sastri opine that both the *Cār* and the *Mṛcch* are the different recensions of the same play—the former possibly a Southern one—,and that the *Cār* is purposely kept a fragment.[1] We shall consider the last view after we examine the relation between the *Cār* and the *Mṛcch*.

1 Raja, *JOR*, 1, p. 245; Jahagirdar, *IA*, 1931, p. 42; Nerurkar, *Mṛcch*, 1924, Intr., pp. 18-19; Hirananda Sastri, *MASI*, 28, p. 22; Sankar, *AMV*, 2, p. 58.

"It must be painfully noted that barring the well considered and methodological writings of some of the distinguished orientalists, many have fallen into the pit of evaluating the merits of the two works only on subjective grounds."[1] Drs. Morgenstierne, Sukthankar and Prof. Paranjape have subjected the texts to a critical test and have proved in their own way that the *Cār* is the original of the *Mṛcch*. Dr. Belvalkar comes to the same conclusion after considering the problem from the point of dramaturgy. In spite of Dr. Raja's statement that the theory of the priority of the *Cār* is "once for all exploded",[2] we still regard it as an open issue and after considering all the available evidence state our own view of the matter. In a genuine scholarly spirit, Dr. Barnett admits that "Dr. Morgenstierne's study has certainly established a fair possiblility for the contention that *Mṛcch* is an adaptation of *Cār*".[3] Dr. Morgenstierne has published the text of the *Cār* with parallel passages from the *Mṛcch* to substantiate his contentions and his investigations have been generally accepted by all as proving the priority of the *Cār*. Dr. Sukthankar's critical study of the text of the two works under four different heads *viz.*, technique, Prakrit, versification, and dramatic incident, leads him to the same conclusion, and independently, Prof. Paranjape also comes to the same conclusion after a critical analysis of the plays.

Reserving the refutation of such of the contrary opinions that remain to be answered for a separate section towards the close of the chapter, we shall consider the relationship between the two plays in brief under vocabulary, technique, Prakrit, and versification, in the light of the previous investigations of the scholars in this field. We have also studied the problem in our own way, showing that the *Cār* and the *Mṛcch* cannot be assigned to the same period owing to the essential differences between them which rendered the theory of both works being different recensions of the same text quite untenable. Our study also shows that all these differences tell of a later date for the *Mṛcch*. We have dealt with the question whether the *Cār* and *Mṛcch* are

1 P. V. Kulkarni, *Mṛcch*, Nerurkar's Edn., 1924. App., p. 4. 2 *JOR*. I, p. 244. 3 *BSOS*, 3, pp. 519-520.

different recensions of the same play later on in this chapter in a separate section, owing to the importance of this aspect of the problem.

1. *Vocabulary.* Dr. Raja traces Malabar influence on the *Cār* on account of the words "*neyyubbhāmana, aṇṭhi* and *nāye,*" which are pure Malabar words; "Pucchīanti" is used in its Malayalam sense.[1] Dr. Thomas pronounces the attempt "to be quite fruitless" and notes that "*aṇṭhi*" is merely a Prakrit form of Sanskrit '*asthi*'.[2] Mr. G. Harihar Sastri in his "Reply" justifies the inclusion of the words in the *Cār* referring the Prakrit form "*nāye*" to Sanskrit "*nāthe*" or "*nāyike,*" and "neyyubbhāmana" to Sanskrit "*snehodbhāvana.*" As regards "*pucchīanti,*" Mr. Sastri remarks that there is no authority to say that it has the sense of 'censure' as in Malayalam; it simply means 'spoken of' in the context in which it is used. An alternative explanation is offered, in that Mr. Sastri says that the original word "*vucchīanti*" was wrongly copied as "*pucchīanti*" owing to the similarity in Malayalam script of these two words.[3] So this does not help to shift the *Cār* to a later date as contended.

2. *Technique.* The *Cār* has no *Nāndi* nor the *Bharatavākya.* The latter omission may be explained as being due to the drama being a fragment as we have already proved. The absence of *Nāndi* and the rudimentary *sthāpanā* in the *Cār* is common with the other Bhāsa dramas, but the *Maṅgala* stanza which we find in other plays, may possibly have slipped out of the text as are the remaining acts. Or the absence may by due to the death of the poet before the final touches regarding the beginning and the end were given. The *Mṛcch* on the other hand has a *Nāndi* verse and an elaborate prologue mentioning the name of the poet, and the work. Now all the classical dramas have their prologue in Sanskrit which implies that the *Mṛcch* must have had some authority for using Prakrit in the prologue against the general vogue. That the *Mṛcch* copied the Prakrit speech of the Sūtradhāra from the *Cār* is also clear from the explanation which precedes the Sūradhāra's speech in Prakrit : एषोऽस्मि भोः, कार्यवशात्प्रयोगवशाच्च प्राकृतभाषी संवृत्तः ।

1 *JOR.* 1, p. 221. 2 *JRAS.* 1928, p. 890 n. 3 *JOR.* 2, pp. 211-213.

showing that the poet thought it necessary to explain why Prakrit was introduced in the *Prastāvanā*. The absence of any such explanatory remarks in the *Cār* indicates its priority.[1]

3. *Prakrit*. It is shown that the *Cār* in common with other works of Bhāsa retains old Prakrit forms against the *Mṛcch* which contains invariably the middle Prakrit. (1) The *Cār* uses the old Prakrit form अहके of the pronoun of first person, and तुवस for second person; while the *Mṛcch* invariably uses हगे or हमो, for the first person, and तुमम् for the latter, which are later forms. (2) The absolutive of verbs गम् and कृ is represented by गच्छिअ and करिअ (कलिअ) in the *Cār*, which the *Mṛcch* gives as गदुअ and कदुअ. (3) Neuter Plural of nom. and acc. of thematic stems ends in -'*āni*' in the *Cār* while in the *Mṛcch* it ends in -'*āiṁ*.' (4) The *Cār* retains assimilated conjuncts, *e. g.* दिश्शदि while the *Mṛcch* has दिसन्ति. The form दिश्श् is never met with in *Mṛcch* which uniformly uses दिस्. (5) The old Prakrit '*āma*' is found in the *Cār* but never in the *Mṛcch*. The former uses '*geha*', while the latter has "*ghala*." (6) The *Mṛcch* further contains a number of Deśī words like *chivia*, *dhakkehi*, *uddhehi karaṭṭa*, *bappa*, *potta*, etc., which denote a later date, while the *Cār* has no such words. (7) The *Cār* does not use Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit, while the *Mṛcch* employs it. We have shown that Bhāsa's Prakrit (which is also found in the *Cār*) is at least as old as the Turfan MSS and Pali: the absence of similar old forms shows a later date for the *Mṛcch*.

4. *Versification*. That in the *Mṛcch* the verses are largely free from the flaws of the corresponding verses of the *Cār* will be readily admitted on all hands; but that this is not invariably the case is shown by Dr. Belvalkar; and therefore as he has well remarked "an argument based upon an æsthetic evaluation of certain verses is certainly misleading and illusive in character".[2] He has simply noted the exception, and this should not, however, make us lose sight of the fact that regarding versification, "the text of the *Mṛcch* makes an

1 *Śākuntala Vyākhyā* to which reference is made later on in this chapter, also assigns the originality to the author of the *Cār* by stating (p. 12): नान्दते पुनः सूत्रधारस्यापि वाङ्मलम्। 2 Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, p. 25; Belvalkar, *OC*, I, p. 198.

advance upon the other play in the following directions—rectification of grammatical mistakes; elimination of redundancies and awkward constructions; and introduction of other changes which may be claimed to be improvements in the form and substance of the verses".[1] This fact is inexplicable unless the priority of the *Cār* be accepted.

It may be noted, further, that the *Mṛcch* in some places shows better judgment by placing the verses from the *Cār* in a better and more suitable context, such as, *e. g.*, विभवानुवशा भार्या etc. in *Cār*, 1, 7, which has been posted in Act III. 28 in the *Mṛcch*, and दारिद्र्यात् पुरुषस्य etc. (*Cār* I. 6) is placed later on in the same act in the *Mṛcch* (I. 36). This answers Bhattanatha Swami's objection in another connection where he argues that if the *Mṛcch* be the borrower there is no reason for it to change the context, and he has given an instance of some dialogues from the later acts of the *Mṛcch* appearing in the earlier acts of the *Cār*.[2] But the *Mṛcch* is shown above to have changed the context in the acts of the *Cār* available to us. It is more reasonable to suppose that a later writer places verses and passages in a suitable context than to credit him with having made a mess of the whole thing for no apparent reason. The *Mṛcch* has effected many improvements in the *Cār* and hence its author may also be taken to have seen the unsuitability of some verses at the places where they were kept by Bhāsa and changed their context.

5. *Dramatic incident.* (1) Time analysis of the two plays reveals the improvements effected be the *Mṛcch* by omissions. The events of the *Mṛcch*, according to Prof. Paranjape, take only five days. The *Cār* ties down the events of the first act to *ṣaṣṭhī* (6th) and the events in the third act seem to have taken place on *aṣṭami* (8th). But there are chronological inconsistencies in the *Cār* by the description of moon-rise and moon-set in the first and third acts respectively taken in conjunction with the *tithi* scheme. The *Mṛcch* has got

1 Sukthankar, *JAOS*, 42, p. 71. 2 *IA*, 45, p. 194, ण वसन्तसेणा, वसन्तसेणो क्खु एसो occurring in the seventh act (p. 126) of the *Mṛcch* has been transferred to the third act (p. 79) of the *Cār* by the writer of the latter work according to Bhattanatha Swami. But in the view of the matter that we take as explained above, the contrary is the case. The author of the *Mṛcch* shifted the sentence to a more suitable context.

over the difficulty by omitting all references to *tithi* but one, and naming it as *Ratnaṣaṣṭhī*.[1] (2) In the first act of the *Cār* the hero's remarks on poverty come to an abrupt end by the scene introducing Vasantasenā. The *Mṛcch* has improved on it by depicting Cārudatta as wrapt in the concentration of mind. This device serves to connect the events in a sequel. (3) In the fourth act of the *Cār* Sajjalaka calls out to Madanikā, while the latter is attending on the heroine and it is strange that Madanikā alone hears him. The *Mṛcch* gets over this by making Śarvilaka wait outside and call out only when Madanikā is sent out by her mistress.

At the close of his study, Dr. Sukthankar places two alternatives before the readers, and no apology is needed, we think, to quote in extenso that portion of his article owing to its importance, and the frank, just, and accurate statements that it contains :

" Let us assume first, for the sake of argument, that the *Cāruḍatta* contains older material....which was worked up later into the *Mṛcchakaṭika*.

"The differences in the technique neither support nor contradict definitely such an assumption. The *nāndī* for all we can say, may have been lost. The words *nāndyante tataḥ praviśati sūtradhāraḥ* do not militate against such a supposition : they could be used with or without a *nāndī* appearing in the text. Moreover, we cannot, in the present state of our knowledge, rightly evaluate the absence of all reference to the name of the play and the play-wright in the *sthāpanā*. To say that in pre-classical times that was the practice is begging the question. The only technique of introduction with which we are familiar is the well-known classical model. Again the only play which is definitely known to antedate the classical plays is the Turfan fragment of Aśvaghoṣa's drama. Unfortunately, as the beginning of the *Śāriputraprakaraṇa* is missing, we are not in a position to say whether the prologue of the dramas of Aśvaghoṣa conformed to the standard of the classical dramas, or that of the dramas of the group under consideration. We are therefore bound to admit that at present we have

1 Paranjape, *Sāhitya Saṅgraha*, I, pp. 103-114 ; Sukthankar, *JAOS*, 42, pp. 70-74.

no clear evidence that can aid us in placing with any degree of assurance, chronologically or topographically, a drama with the technical peculiarities of the *Cārudatta*.

"But the priority of the *Cārudatta* version would explain, and satisfactorily explain, all the other differences between the two plays. It would explain the presence of archaisms in the Prakrit of the *Cārudatta*. It would explain why many of the verses of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* are free from the flaws of the corresponding verses of the *Cārudatta* ; the grammatical corrections one may be justified in regarding as an indication of an increasingly insistent demand for scrupulous purity of language. The hypothesis would lastly explain the reason for the differences in the incidents of the action of the play. All this is legitimate field of 'diaskeuasis', and is readily intelligible.

" Let us now examine the other possibility, and try to explain the divergences on the assumption of the priority of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* version.

" The question of the technical differences between the plays has been dealt with already. It was submitted that this part of the evidence was inconclusive ; it supported neither one side nor the other.

" We will proceed to the next point, the Prakrit. On the assumption of the priority of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* version, it is at first sight not quite clear, how the *Cārudatta* should happen to contain Prakrit forms older than those found in (what is alleged to be) a still older play. But a little reflection will suffice to bring home to us the fact that it is not impossible to account for this anomaly. We have only to regard the *Cārudatta* as the version of a different province or a different literary tradition, which had not accepted the innovations in Prakrit that later became prevalent. In other words we have to assume merely that the Prakrit neologisms of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* are unauthorized innovations and that the *Cārudatta* manuscripts have only preserved some of the Old-Prakrit forms of the original *Mṛcchakaṭika*. This does not, however, necessarily make the *Cārudatta* version older than the *Mṛcchakaṭika* version. The *Cārudatta* would become a recension of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* with archaic Prakrit. Thus the Prakrit archaisms of

the *Cārudatta* may be said to be not irreconcilable with the general priority of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* version.

" It is much more difficult to explain why the *Mṛcchakaṭika* should consistently offer better readings of the verses. Some of the discrepancies could perhaps be explained away as the result of misreading and faulty transcript, but not all. We could not explain, for instance, why the excellent pāda : *tīkṣṇaṁ viṣāṇāgram ivāvaśiṣṭam* should have been discarded, and another, *viṣāṇakoṭiva nimajjamānā*, be substituted, forsooth with the faulty *nimajjamānā*. Why should there be a change in the first place, and *why should the change be consistently for the worse* ? We could not reasonably hold the copyists guilty of introducing *systematically* such strange blunders and inexcusable distortions.

" Let us combine the archaisms of the Prakrit with the imperfections of the Sanskrit verses. On the assumption of the priority of the *Cārudatta*, we are asked to believe that while the compiler of the *Cārudatta* had carefully copied out from older manuscripts all the Prakrit archaisms, he had systematically mutilated the Sanskrit verses, which is a *reductio ad absurdum* !

" Let us proceed to the fourth point. The theory of the priority of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, which could with difficulty be supported in the case of the divergencies already considered, breaks down altogether when we try to account for the inconsistencies in the action of the *Cārudatta* in general, and in particular the presence of the *tithi*-scheme, which latter serves no purpose, aesthetic or didactic, but on the other hand introduces gratuitously an indisputable incongruity. The deleting of the whole *tithi*-scheme admits of a simple, self-evident explanation, acceptable to every impartial critic. But, assuming that the original play contained no trace of it, can any one pretend to be able to give a satisfactory reason for the deliberate introduction of the *tithi*-scheme ?

" Taking all things into account, we conclude, we can readily understand the evolution of a *Mṛcchakaṭika* version from a *Cārudatta* version, but not *vice versa*. The special appeal of this hypothesis lies in the fact that it explains not merely isolated variations, but whole categories of them : it implies the formulation of a

single uniform principle to explain diverse manifestations.

"It may be that I have overlooked inconsistencies and flaws in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* version, absent from the other, which could be better explained on the contrary supposition of the priority of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* version. If so, the problem becomes still more complicated, and will need further investigation from a new angle. I merely claim that I have furnished here some *prima facie* reasons for holding that the *Cārudatta* version is on the whole older than the *Mṛcchakaṭika* version; hence (as a corollary) if our *Cārudatta* is not itself the original of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, then, we must assume, it has preserved a great deal of the original upon which the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is based".[1]

The essential differences between the two plays also show the priority of the *Cār*. Dr. Belvalkar, in a recent article, rightly states the position when he says: "That Sūdraka's *Mṛcchakaṭika* completes (with certain deliberate modifications) the *Daridracārudatta* of Bhāsa is now a generally accepted proposition".[2]

We do not mean hereby to pronounce the author of the *Mṛcch* as a mere amplifier. He is a dramatist and a humorist of no mean order and this would also be established from the renown he has been enjoying so far. Dr. Charpentier credits him with the later five acts as also with the composition of the gamblers' scene, and the description of Vasantasenā's palace.[3] Dr. Belvalkar, however, after a careful psychological investigation into the motives underlying the elaborations of the later author, finds that the gamblers' scene, political bye-plot, broad and rollicking humour are the creations of the later author. The additions, according to him, are motivated by (1) an exhibition of the author's knowledge and familiarity with highly technical and out of way *śāstras*, (2) an introduction of low-life realism, (3) the addition of the political bye-plot, and (4) an appeal to the gallery by means of broad and rollicking humour.[4] Dr. Hirananda, however, takes the gamblers' scene as a later interpolation in the *Mṛcch*, in addition to the incident of Dhūtā's immolation, which has commonly

1 *JAOS*, 42. pp. 71-74. 2 *JBHU* 1. p. 21. 3 *JRAS* 1923, p. 603.
4 *OC.I.* pp. 199, 204; Summaries, p. ii-iii.

been accepted as an interpolation since the time of Nīlakaṇṭha.[1]

This brings us to the consideration of the POLITICAL BYE-PLOT which has been asserted by some to have been excised from the *Cār* by significant omissions.[2] The question on the contrary should be to state the reason why the *Cār* "carefully removed all allusions to Pālaka and Āryaka if Śūdraka's play were the original"[3] The very fact that it could have been so removed tells very strongly against its having formed a structural unit with the whole play, and clearly postulates its posteriority. It has been shown that the political episode is very loosely connected with the main story; the second half of the *Mṛcch*, therefore, "is partly spoilt by the contamination of two subjects that stood originally in no relation whatever to each other".[4] It can be removed from the play without any prejudice to the development of the dramatic action. There is no necessity of Āryaka for the exchange of carriages, and Cārudatta's innocence would be established without the intercession of Śarvilaka, simply by Vasantasenā's reappearance. The gamblers' scene in which we get a first hint about the political affair is, even according to one anti-Bhasaite, an interpolation.[5] Prof. A. K. Pisharoti says that the scene was omitted from the *Cār* on account of its not being fitted for the stage.[6] This statement requires a further proof that the scene formed an integral part of the original drama, which, as we have seen, it did not. We have further, in the words of Dr. Belvalkar, shown causes that led the later writer to incorporate the bye-plot. The skill with which the later writer (Śūdraka, for the matter of that) has executed the task of weaving the two disconnected stories successfully, would be evident from the fact that it has come to be regarded as an inseparable whole. There is some difference of opinion as to the historicity of Āryaka and Pālaka as also of the revolution.[7] If Pālaka and Gopāla are identical with those connected with the Udayana legend, it seems

1 *MASI*, 28, p. 23. 2 Bhattanatha, *IA*, 45, p. 194; Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, pp. 32-40. 3 Winternitz, *Problems*, p. 114. 4 Charpentier, *JRAS*, 1923, pp. 603, 606, 607 at p. 607. 5 Hirananda Sastri, *MASI*, 28, p. 23. 6 Criticism, pp. 33-34. 7 We have considered the problem as to the identities of Pālaka and Āryaka and the historicity of the revolution in chapter VIII, under 'Cārudatta —(6) *Critical Study*.

rather peculiar that Bhāsa did not make use of the revolution incident in his play, especially as it would have made a wonderfully inseparable unit with the love story. Among a number of Śūdrakas we identify the author of the *Mṛcch* with Āndhra Simuka.[1]

AUTHORSHIP OF MṚCCHAKAṬIKA.

The prologue to the *Mṛcch*, no doubt, contains later additions and elements; but that does not justify us in discarding it altogether as untrue. It is more reasonable to take the traditional statements as true till the contrary is proved than to treat them the other way. The prologue in the *Mṛcch* must, therefore, be supposed to contain some elements of truth in it. The description of the regal author is generally seen to apply to Simuka, the Āndhra king. It may be contended that Simuka had no time to compose dramas as he was engaged in wars; but most probably the *Mṛcch* is the work of some court poet of Śūdraka, perhaps Rāmila or Saumila or both. As the times were not peaceful, the poets took a ready-made drama to work upon. They found some political revolution, contemporary or earlier, and made additions to the original that would appeal to the gallery. This supposition explains to some extent the southern influence shown by the *Mṛcch*, as also the silence of Kālidāsa about Śūdraka though the latter preceded him. The Āndhras were southerners, and also Kālidāsa may be taken to have known that the *Mṛcch* was neither an independent work nor was it the composition of Śūdraka. The influence of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* seen in the *Mṛcch* need not speak of a later date for the latter as both have copied from the common source, *viz.*, Bhāsa.

The cumulative effect of all that has been stated regarding the relationship of the two plays would, it is hoped, convey to every unbiassed critic the priority of the *Cār* over the *Mṛcch* and this in itself would contradict the opinion that the two are different versions of the same play. Importance of the point, however, requires a detailed treatment.

---

1 We have dealt with the "Authorship and date of the Mrechakatika" at some length in a paper submitted to the Ninth All India Oriental Conference, Trivandrum; it has been accepted for publication in the *JHARS*.

CĀRUDATTA AND MṚCCHAKAṬIKA: DIFFERENT RECENSIONS OF THE SAME PLAY?

That the plays are known by different titles is a factor strongly against the above assumption. It is no answer to say that '*Vatsarājacarita*' is an alternative title of the *Pratijñā*. '*Vatsarājacarita*' is known to be a work of Śūdraka and it cannot be identified with the anonymous *Pratijñā*. Abhinavagupta gives it as an alternative title for the *Ratnāvalī* in his *Dhvanyālokalocana* (p. 162, Kāvyamāla).[1] Hence the *Cār* and the *Mṛcch* also are distinct works. Rhetoricians down from Vāmana distinguish between the *Cār* and the *Mṛcch* testifying to their being different works.

Vāmana has in all three quotations, *viz.* (V. 1. 3) यासां बलिः etc., (IV. 3.23) द्यूतं हि नाम पुरुषस्यासिंहासनं राज्यम्। and (IV. 3.23) व्यसनं हि नाम सोच्छ्वासं मरणम्। Of these the first, as stated already, agrees more with the *Cār* (I. 2) than with the *Mṛcch* (I. 9); the second one in the *Mṛcch* only (Act II, p. 38); and the last seems to be a misquotation for दारिद्र्यं खलु नाम मनस्विनः पुरुषस्य सोच्छ्वासं मरणम्। occurring only in the *Cār* (p. 11). Vāmana, therefore, seems to have been aware of both the versions, and is possibly quoting from memory. Śūdraka's works are further credited with having much *śleṣa* in them, "*śleṣa* obviously referring to the intricate and subtle evolution of the story and the plot".[2] Thus Vāmana can be shown to have knowledge of the *Mṛcch* being an amplified evolution of the *Cār* by the infusion of the political plot. Or the expression may refer to the *śleṣa-guṇa* that has been incorporated into the other material by Śūdraka which also imputes knowledge to Vāmana of both plays. It is wrong to dismiss with scant courtesy the testimony of Vāmana.[3]

Next, we come to Abhinavagupta who in his *Bharatanāṭyavedavivṛti* refers to a *Daridracārudatta*; and Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, in their *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* mention *Daridracārudatta* and *Mṛcchakaṭika* side by side.[4]

---

1 That the *Pratijñā* is quite distinct from the *Vatsarājacarita* is evident from Mr. Kavi's statement that the *Vatsarājacarita* by Śūdraka will be published in the Dakṣiṇa Bhārati Series (*JAHRS*, 2, p. 143). 2 Ganapati Sastri, *Critical Study* p. 92. 3 Cf. Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, p. 21. 4 Cf. Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925 p. 272.

A MS of *Śakuntalāvyākhyā* in the Madras Oriental MSS Library (R. No. 2778) hitherto unpublished, at p. 12 mentions the *Cār* among other dramas, and notes the Prakrit speech of the Sūtradhāra as a peculiarity to be found in the *Cār* (चारुदत्ते पुनः सूत्रधारस्यापि प्राकृतम्। तच्चिन्त्यम्।). The *Cār* is again mentioned on p. 23.[1] This would imply that according to the commentator, the author of the *Cār* was the originator of the device of employing Prakrit for the speech of the Sūtradhāra. The MS has been assigned to the fourteenth century A. D. and proves that '*Svapnavāsavadattā*' is the full title of the Trivandrum play.

Thus, Vāmana proves the existence of the *Cār* and *Mṛcch* at his time. Abhinavagupta, *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* and the *Śakuntalāvyākhyā* show that *Daridracārudatta* is an alternative title for our *Cār*. There are some writers subsequent to Vāmana who mention only the *Mṛcch* and not the *Cār*; but that does not establish the non-existence of the latter, as it is already mentioned by Vāmana. The distinctness of the two works having been pronounced since a long time, it is rather strange how both are taken to be one and the same, especially when the *Mṛcch* is shown to contain later traits and improvements.

In considering the relationship between the plays, essential differences that they show were reserved for consideration on a later occasion, and we shall deal with them here. They will also add one more chain to the evidence showing the priority of the *Cār*, and once for all explode the theory of the two being different recensions of the same play.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CĀRUDATTA AND MṚCCHAKAṬIKA.

1. The *Cār*, in common with the other Bhāsa plays, does not mention the word '*nāṇaka*,' but uses the general term 'suvarṇa' in its stead. The *Mṛcch*, on the other hand, clearly uses the word *nāṇaka* (I. 23; II. 5 णिण्णाणअरअ [निर्नाणकस्य]), which shifts the *Mṛcch* at any rate, to a later date than the works of Bhāsa.[2]

2. In the opening of the third act in the *Cār* and

1 V. Sarma, *IHQ*, 1929, p. 726. 2 Cf. Sankar, *AMV*, 2, p. 62.

the *Mṛcch* there is a reference to music and singing. It is significant to note in this connection that Bhāsa uses no musical term, while Śūdraka employs the terms '*mūrcchanā*' (III. 5), and '*kākalī*' (*Mṛcch* p. 53), which shows that the latter "improved upon Bhāsa, the improvement consisting in the insertion of the musical terminology to make them [*i. e.* the statements of his predecessor] more effective".[1]

3. The elaborate and exhaustive description of the various courts of Vasantasenā as given in the *Mṛcch* (Act IV, p. 78-86) corresponds closely with the *Bṛhatkathā Ślokasaṁgraha* thus indicating a late date for the *Mṛcch*, while the *Cār* has only a few sentences for the same (p. 97 अहो गणिआवाडस्स सस्सिरीअदा। थाआपट्ठअसमागदेहि आआमिएहि पुत्तआ वाईअन्ति। संखोजअन्ति अ आहारप्पआराणि। वीणा वादीअन्ति। सुवण्णआरा अलङ्कारप्पआराणि आदरेण जोअअन्ति); but we would not thereby place Śūdraka to a period later than *Bṛhatkathā Ślokasaṁgraha*, as is suggested by Dr. Keith, especially on account of the probability of Śūdraka's having access to the original of the *Bṛhatkathā*.[2]

4. The *Mṛcch* betrays full knowledge of planetary astrology in the sixth act (vv 9, 10). There is no corresponding portion of the *Cār* available for comparison with the former, but in general it may be stated, having regard to the scanty knowledge which Bhāsa possesses about astrology (*i. e.*, *nakṣatras* and not *rāśis*) it seems safe to presume that the later acts of the *Cār* also did not have references to such developed stage of astrology. On this ground, Mr. Sankar fixes the lower limit of Śūdraka as 505 A. D., but this is doubtful.[3] This much, however, is certain that the *Cār* is considerably earlier.

5. Opinion is unanimous that the *Mṛcch* shows a deeper sympathy towards Buddhism. The author of the *Cār* is a champion of orthodox Brahmanism and, in the other plays of the group, tries to ridicule the Buddhist monk wherever he finds an opportunity. Cf. *Cār*, p. 74. कत्तमकरणीकिदमेदो विअ सक्किअसमणओ। Saṁvāhaka leaves Vasantasenā to turn a *Parivrāt* in the *Cār*, while in the *Mṛcch* he becomes a *Śākyaśramaṇaka*. This has led Mr. Sankar to say that the *Cār* represents a later stage

1 Bhide, *Svapna*, Intr. p. 26. 2 *HSL*, p. 271. 3 *AMV*. 2, p. 64.

when Buddhism had deteriorated.[1] Admitting this for a moment, how can Mr. Sankar explain the same derogatory remarks about the Buddhist monks in the *Pratijñā* and *Avi*, which he has assigned to the author of the *Mṛcch*?[2] It is on the other hand a well-known fact that a new religion is generally looked down upon in its infancy, and gradually increases in its following. Dr. Winternitz surmises that Śūdraka was really a Śūdra who found better treatment from Buddhism than from the orthodox religion;[3] but this is not borne out by the internal evidence since the author praises Brāhmaṇa-bhojana, etc. Mr. Padhye, a well-known Buddhist scholar, has also shown that the religious atmosphere as portrayed in Bhāsa, Śūdraka and Kālidāsa places Śūdraka later than the *Cār*, and Kālidāsa the last of the three.[4]

6. The science of thieving as propounded by Sajjalaka in the *Cār* (p. 75) and Sarvilaka in the *Mṛcch* (p. 57) tells the same story. Sarvilaka mentions Kārtikeya as the patron deity and Kanakaśakti, Devavrata, Bhāskaranandin and Yogācārya as masters in the art. Sajjalaka, on the other hand, invokes the aid of Kharapaṭa. As the name occurs in a later work from the South, *viz.*, the Mattavilāsa, it is contended that the *Cār* got it from the Southern tradition and hence it is an adaptation of the *Mṛcch*. Now, it should be noted that the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* also mentions Kharapaṭa, stating that the details as to the particular implements of torture to be used in the particular case, measure of punishment, etc., should be learnt from Kharapaṭa.[5] This shows that before Kauṭilya, the treatise by Kharapaṭa was well known. It is only in later literature, that a confusion is made between Kharapaṭa and Mūladeva, and hence it is useless to infer from the identity stated in later literature, that Kharapaṭa is the same as Mūladeva, and that the works mentioning Kharapaṭa are later than Mūladeva, the hero of Śūdraka's *Padmaprābhṛtaka*.[6] Hence, the mention of Kharapaṭa in Kauṭilya's

---

1 *AMV*, 2, pp. 57-58. 2 Cf. *Pratijñā*, pp. 43-45: अयं ब्राह्मणभावे । वैद्यमत्तएण समणएण अभयं दीअदि । etc. *Avi*, p. 72: किण्णुखु दीअदि णग्गन्धस्समणिआ । Mr. Sankar enumerates these two *viz. Pratijñā* and *Avi* among the works of Śūdraka, *AMV*, 2, p. 64. 3 *Geschichte der indischen Lit*, III, pp. 205 *ff*. 4 *OC*, VII, Summaries, pp. 168-170; also, *IC*, 1937, pp. 61-72 5 *Kauṭ. Arth.*, IV, 8 p. 221: तस्योपकरणं प्रमाणं ग्रहणं प्रचारणमवचारणं च खरपट्टादागमयेत् । 6 Sankar, *AMV*, 2, p. 56.

Arthaśāstra disproves this identity "inasmuch as Mūladeva is said to be a contemporary of Puṣyamitra,"[1] Thus Kharapaṭa in the *Cār* instead of proving the work to be an adaptation confirms an old tradition.

The cumulative effect of all the factors noted above should be, it is hoped, to establish the priority of the *Cār* and to discredit the suggestion of the two works being different recensions. If, however, by different versions of the same play it is meant to convey the idea of improvements and additions at a later date, it may be acceptable to style these as versions of the same play. Dr. Raja maintains that the Southern MSS of the *Mṛcch*, if found, will prove the play to be nothing other than the *Cār*.[2] His failure to get another MS of the *Viṇā* as well as of other Bhāsa plays clearly shows that Dr. Raja has failed to appreciate the importance of MM. Dr. Sastri's discovery.

CĀRUDATTA : AN ABRIDGMENT FOR STAGE PURPOSES?

The priority of the *Mṛcch* implies its subsequent adaptation for purposes of stage. We have already proved that none of the plays of our group can be called adaptations or abridgments. The case of the *Cār*, however, stands on a different footing; for, in spite of the inclusion of the name of the *Cār* in the handbooks of the Cākyārs, down to his latest article on "The Kerala Theatre", the champion of the Kerala origin has been constrained to admit that "regarding the *Cār*, no information is yet available as regards its ever having been popular on the Kerala stage."[3] Thus notwithstanding his intimate knowledge and acquaintance with the Kerala actors and everything connected with South Indian Drama and Theatre in general, Prof. K. R. Pisharoti was unable to get confirmation of his surmise as to the alleged popularity of the *Cār* in Kerala.[4] Yet, this sufficed for him to explain the crudities in style and technique, as well as the cases of bad judgment to be met with in the *Cār* which are inconsistent with its later date, by supposing the adaptation to have been made 'in haste'. On the contrary, the stage version ought to be more perfect and more presentable. Rightly

1 G. Harihar Sastri, *AMV*, 1, pp. 224-227 at p. 227. 2 *JOR*, 1, pp. 244-245; letter dated 26th November 1936. 3 *AUJ*, 3, 1934, p. 158. 4 Cf. *IHQ*, 1, p. 339; *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 250.

has Dr. Charpentier remarked about these arguments that they " do not seem to be convincing so far as concerns this special question."[1] There are many instances to disprove the view that the *Cār* is an abridgment ; *e. g.*, at some places it is more exhaustive and at times has many dialogues and verses that are altogether absent in the *Mṛcch.* Further, there is no motive for excluding the political bye-plot altogether and yet present the play as a harmonious whole and preserve its main features, which cannot be accomplished by simple actors especially when they are 'in a hurry'.[2] Dr. Belvalkar takes just the opposite view in the case which appears to be the correct one, that " *Mṛcch* of Śūdraka is a deliberate amplification of the earlier play of Bhāsa, undertaken from specific dramaturgic motives.".[3]

REFUTATION OF CONTRARY VIEWS.

Prof. Devdhar deals at length about मारुताभिलाषी प्रदोषः and प्रवेश्यतामभ्यन्तरचतुःशालम् (*Cār*, p. 36) and concludes that this is a significant inadvertence of the epitomizer.[4] But this is not so. मारुताभिलाषी प्रदोषः means that the evening is hot (lit. expects cold) and hence there is no longer any necessity of the mantle to Cārudatta and he asks the maid to take it inside. प्रवेश्यतामभ्यन्तरचतुःशालम् has been explained by the learned Professor himself by stating that this reading occurs in some MSS of the *Mṛcch* also, signifying thereby that the latter improved upon it.

Unmotivated remarks are made to look natural, dialogues are cleverly worded and suitable amplifications and omissions are effected by the later writer of the *Mṛcch*, as already stated above. This answers some of the other arguments of Prof. Devdhar. It is against common sense and unnatural why the later writer should always omit a good sentence, use archaic language, show no judgment, which is again inconsistent with his being a 'clever' man.

The additions of the political bye-plot, the gamblers' scene, etc. testify to the cleverness of the later playwright and do not prove omissions. Vidūṣaka is said

---

1 *JRAS*, 1925, p. 245. The learned Doctor 'would still venture to look upon (the *Mṛcch*) as a later and extended version of the *Cār*'. (*JRAS*, 1925, p. 245)
2 Cf. Pisharoti, *JOR*, 2, p. 385. 3 *OC*, I, p. 204. 4 *Plays etc.*, pp. 27-28.

to make an unauthorized statement in the *Cār*, and this has been assigned to the bad memory of the adaptor.[1] But Vidūṣakas are privileged to make any statement, though not authorized by the hero, in the latter's interest. There is no serious mistake in it.[2]

As regards the failure of Vidūṣaka to answer the question इयमदार्नी का (*Cār*, p. 37), and the awkwardness of putting the same remark (*viz.* इं, साहसिओ। *Cār*, p. 93) in the mouth of two characters in different parts of the house, which have been taken as the instances of over-much condensation,[3] we say, they are not really so; they are explicable without any reference to the *Mṛcch*. In the first instance, Vidūṣaka's silence may be taken to be due to his being aware of the fact that Cārudatta would come to know the name of the woman in the course of the message of Śakāra which Vidūṣaka was presently going to deliver to Cārudatta. In the latter case, the remarks of both at the same time but at different places are quite appropriate, as both hear the same story; and the spectators actually see both and can appreciate those remarks. So the above instances show that the author of the *Mṛcch* in his anxiety to leave nothing for the imagination of the spectators has filled up the lacunæ. The number of such instances proclaims the author of the *Mṛcch* to be simply a writer of bookish dramas having no sense of the effects on the stage; many additions that cannot be represented on the stage also point in the same direction. That the *Cār* and all the plays in our group are "the works of a born dramatist, wonderfully adapted to the stage," and thus the author "is a dramatist of a very high order" does not necessarily mean that the *Cār* has been specially abridged for the stage as Prof. Devdhar and others contend, especially as there is no proof of the popularity of the *Cār* on the stage.[4] Regarding Prof. Devdhar's objection as to the omission of the references to the law-suit, etc.,[5] we reply that the later acts of the *Cār* might have contained the incidents. The present state of affairs does not justify the inference that the references were purposely ousted.

1 *Plays etc.*, p. 31. 2 Cf. Vidūṣaka in the *Svapna*, Act IV, pp. 88–89. 3 Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, pp. 28–30. 4 Cf. Winternitz, *Problems*, p. 129; Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, p. 26; Pisharoti, *JOR*, 2, p. 385; A. K Pisharoti, *Criticism*, p. 33. In an earlier paragraph in this chapter (p. 170) we have referred to the alleged popularity of the *Cār* on the stage. 5 Devdhar, *Plays etc.*, pp. 32–35.

The absence of Ceṭa in the first four acts does not prevent his being brought on the stage later on. Āryaka is not at all necessary for the 'swapping' of the bullock-carts. Rohasena also can easily be dispensed with. The answer to this aspect of the problem depends on the view we take of the integrity or otherwise of the political bye-plot with the story of the play. If the political bye-plot is the backbone, if it is necessary for the development of the plot, the author of the *Cār* must be taken to have omitted the references. But this is open to the serious objection how it was that the original writer composed his work in such a way as to make it possible for the subsequent epitomizer to separate the bye-plot without harming the main story; besides "we can see no reason why the author of the *Cār* should have carefully removed all allusions to Āryaka and Pālaka, if Śūdraka's play were the original";[1] while it is quite reasonable to suppose that the later amplifier added the bye-plot and weaved it so cleverly as to make of both a harmonious whole. The above also negatives the similar contentions of Prof. A. K. Pisharoti and others.

The inference that "the author desired to give a touch of finality to the play" from the sentence अमुदंकथादअं संवुत्तं (*Cār* p. 103) and इदासे ! मा हु कइदावेहि (*Cār* p. 104) is, in the opinion of Prof. Devdhar himself, "too ingenious an interpretation."[2] As noted above, there is an overwhelming evidence against such an interpretation.

Mr. Bhattanatha Swami and Dr. Raja trace Malabar influence in the *Cār* [p. 82, (कर्णौ स्पृष्ट्वा) इदि तालीपत्तं खु एदं।] and state that it refers to a local custom "to wear rolls of palm leaf as an ear ornament."[3] That this custom is not confined to Malabar but was prevalent in ancient India in the north also, is evident from विन्ध्येवोन्मुक्तताल्पत्रा in the description of Vindhya in Bāṇa's *Kādambarī* (p. 40, Nirṇayasagar Edition).

In the *Mṛcch*, Cārudatta's wife is styled '*Vadhūḥ*' while in the *Cār*, she is called '*Brāhmaṇī*.' A reference has been found in the latter to the Malabar custom of the Brāhmaṇas keeping the ladies of semi-Brāhmaṇa caste (known as Brāhmaṇīs in Malabar) "as their wives without

1 Winternitz, *CR*, December 1924, p. 333. 2 *Plays etc.*, p. 36. 3 Bhattanatha, *Id.*, 45, p. 194 n3; Raja, *JOR*, 1 p. 224.

religious sanction or legal commitment."[1] But, '*Brāhmaṇī*' in the Sanskrit dramas means nothing more than a 'Brāhmaṇa's wife.' The argument loses its force when we find the same form used in the *Mṛcch* more than once.[2]

Thus, a careful study of all the available material and also the full consideration of the probabilities of the case lead us to the following conclusions : That the *Cār* is the original play and it is incomplete as we have it; that the *Cār* had at least nine acts which developed on the same lines as the later acts of the *Mṛcch* ; that the author of the *Mṛcch* added the political bye-plot, and the gamblers' scene and effected many improvements with regard to characterization, versification, etc.

---

1 Raja, *JOR*, 1, p. 224. 2 Cf. *Mṛcch* p. 65: कधं बम्हणी मामणुकम्पदे। *Mṛcch*, IX. 29.; हा बम्हणि ! द्विजकुले विमले प्रसूता। *Mṛcch*, p. 209: णीदीए दाव बम्हणीए भिण्णउणो चिदाणिवोदण पावं जदाहरन्ति रिसीओ। Also Cf. Harihar Sastri, *JOR*, 2, pp. 213-214.

CHAPTER VII

THIRTEEN BHĀSA PLAYS.

In this Chapter we shall mainly deal with the Thirteen Bhāsa plays ; but it is considered advisable to offer some preliminary remarks in brief on the origin of the Indian Drama and the types of Sanskrit Drama before beginning the main topic.

ORIGIN OF INDIAN DRAMA.

Like everything Indian, the origin of Indian drama is steeped in mystery, veiled in obscurity and darkness ; and like most Indian things the origin is shown to be religious and said to be found in the *Ṛgveda*. It was Max Müller who first drew attention to the peculiar nature of the dialogue (*Saṁvāda*) hymns in the *Ṛgveda* saying that the hymns were probably recited by different parties representing different speakers of the hymns, after the completion of a ritual.[1] But the hymns as they stand are almost incomprehensible ; so Windisch suggested, on the analogy of old Irish songs, that these hymns were a kind of narrative literature, in which the *Ṛks* (verses) alternated with the prose passages which were to be added according to the exigencies of the case.[2] The *Ṛks* were considered to be fixed. Pischel lent his support to Windisch, and pointed out that the connecting links were supplied by a class of rhapsodists called ***granthikas***, who, as the etymological meaning ("the connectors") signifies, used

1 *SBE*, XXXII, pp. 182-183. For this section and the next we are indebted especially to Keith's *Sanskrit Drama*, Mankad's *Types of Sanskrit Drama*, Kulkarni's *Sanskrit Drama and Dramatists* and the articles in the *Modern Review* by Ghosh (December 1928, pp. 586-599) and Das Gupta (1918, pp. 249-254). 2 Verhandlungen der 33. Versammlung Deutscher Philologen und Schulmaenner in Gera, pp. 28 ff ; Cf. Winternitz, *HSL*, I, p. 101 n1.

to connect the hymns to the prose narrations of a flexible character.[1] On account of the parallelism between the *Suparṇādhyāya* (where such alternations are found) and certain *Jātakas*, Oldenberg put forth a novel theory of the *Ākhyāna* type of literature, which consisted of a certain number of fixed verses supplemented and elucidated by prose passages which were not fixed and left completely to the judgment of the rhapsodists.[2] The *Ākhyāna* theory did not find much support, and Schroeder boldly opposed it.[3] It is defective in that the parallelism is merely accidental and the loss of the prose passages, when the metrical portion is quite intact, is incomprehensible. The rise of the *granthikas* or rhapsodists, further, appertains to a later epoch when the epics and the legendary type of literature came into existence. Schroeder says that though the *Saṁvāda* hymns presuppose a kind of Saga or legend, it is not correct to state that the prose passages formed the necessary portion of the hymns. The Purūravas hymn, for example, in spite of its obscure portions is complete in itself and is a brilliant piece of artistic poetry. Schroeder, however, gives full play to his imagination when he sees full-fledged mystery plays in the dialogue hymns. Winternitz with his usual dislike for enunciating novel bold theories unless fully convinced, strikes the golden mean; in some dialogues he sees the ancient *Ākhyānas*, while in others he recognizes some sort of cult dramas.[4] Hertel sees in the *Suparṇādhyāya* a full-fledged mystery.[5] It is really curious and perplexing to find how the same data could give rise to such diverse theories; these scholars being weighed under some ethnological considerations or those of the Christian mystery plays, read too much in the *Saṁvāda* hymns and formulated their pet theories, all of which, unfortunately, do not stand proved beyond doubt. We may, however, assume that in the dialogue hymns are to be found the first germs of Indian drama.

---

1 *Home of the Puppet Play*, p. 14; Ved. Stud., I, pp. 284 ff. 2 Das altindische Ākhyāna, *ZDMG*, 37, pp. 54 ff; Akhyana Hymnen im Rgveda, *ZDMG*, 39, pp. 52 ff; *Das Mahabharata*, pp. 21 ff. 3 *Mysterium und Mimus im Rgveda*, 1908. 4 *WZKM*, 23, p. 102 ff; *Problems*, pp. 45-46. 5 *VOJ*, xviii, p. 59 ff, 187 ff; xxiii, pp. 273 ff; xxiv, pp. 117 ff. Charpentier, *VOJ*, xxiii. pp. 33ff; according to Keith, Charpentier's "*Die Suparnasage* (1922)" is somewhat confused and uncritical" (*SD*, p. 16 n2). Hertel further defends his theory as to the origin of Indian drama and answers Oldenberg, Konow and Charpentier in an appendix to his German translation of *Mattavilāsa* (Leipsig, 1924)-Cf. Barnett, *BSOS*, 3, p. 890.

The disappearance of the dialogue hymns from the younger Vedas may seem fatal to the above view ; but it should be noted that the other Vedas were thoroughly ritualistic, while the dialogue hymns were not used in any ritual ; and in course of time actors came to be looked down upon. That the institution was in existence may be inferred from the use of the word '*Śailūṣa*' in the *Yajurveda* (Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā, XXX. 4). The *Sāmaveda* came into existence for the purpose of putting the *Ṛgveda* to tune and hence shows that the art of music had been fully developed by the Vedic age. The *Atharvaveda* refers to ceremonial dances (XII. 141). Thus, song, music and dance—the main constituents of drama—seem to be developed to some extent in the Vedic period.

In the *Brāhmaṇas*, we find a strong dramatic element. The ritual and the attendant ceremonies thereto were quite complex, and display amusements which are characteristically ritual. The ceremony of buying the soma plant affords a good illustration in point.[1] The purchaser is a Brāhmaṇa and the seller a Śudra. There ensues a lively dialogue between the two, in which there is much haggling ; if the seller resists, the Brāhmaṇa beats him and takes possession of the Soma by force. Eventually they come to terms, the price is settled and paid and the Soma is carried in procession. The *Mahāvrata* festival also is another ritualistic amusement of the period.[2] A Vaiśya of white complexion falls out with a Śūdra of black complexion for a piece of round white skin. The latter is defeated and chased out of the arena by the Vaiśya. A Brāhmaṇa and a hetæra appear later on in the scene and quarrel with each other using abusive language. Hillebrandt correctly finds in the ceremony the relic of a popular festival.[3] As the festival was performed at the winter solstice, Keith takes it to be a fertility ritual and thus postulates religious origin for Indian drama to which we shall advert later on.[4] Analogy of the Greek drama is brought in support of the contention of the religious origin of the Indian drama.[5]

---

1 Keith, *SD*, p. 23. 2 Keith, *SD*, pp. 21, 24-27, 44-45, etc. 3 *Ritual Literature*, p. 157 ; See Konow, *Das Indische Drama*, p. 42. 4 Keith, *SD*, p. 24. 5 Keith, *SD*, pp. 36-42 ; Cf. Janvier, *Madhyama*, Intr. p. 7.

The epics show a deprecatory attitude towards drama and the rarity of references in the *Upaniṣads* and *Sūtras* also displays the same attitude. By the time of Pāṇini, the dramatic literature seems to have grown so much in bulk that there were already *Naṭa-sūtras* by Śilāli and Kṛśāśva,—the first fruits of the labours of ancient Indian dramatic theoreticians.[1] In the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali (III.2.III) we get undeniable evidence of actual, full-fledged dramas.[2] The *Mahābhāṣya* passage mentions three kinds of representations, the latter two of which refer to those (*ii*) by means of paintings or picture scrolls, and (*iii*) by a set of professional reciters—*granthikas* or *kathakas*. The first kind of representation was that given by Śobhanikas who actually performed *Kaṁsavadha* or *Balibandhana*. (ये तावदेते शौभनिका नामैते प्रत्यक्षं कंसं घातयन्ति प्रत्यक्षं बलिं बन्धयन्ति इति।) The word प्रत्यक्षम् clearly shows that Śobhanikas were human actors who assumed different roles of Kaṁsa and Kṛṣṇa and performed the whole piece on the stage. Keith's theory that *Kaṁsavadha* and *Balibandhana* were mere dumb-shows does not stand to reason, as such an interpretation would defeat the very purpose for which these representations were intended.[3] Without dialogue, the whole performance would amount to mere manual acts of wrestling or binding which would be quite unintelligible for understanding of the epic stories. There is, further, no evidence of any dumb-show in ancient India. Keith objects to the meaning 'actor' attached to the word Śobhanika or Śaubhika.[4] The word is rarely used in that sense ; but the word 'lena sobhika' appears in a Mathurā inscription, and Lüders himself, who in his paper on the Śaubhikas has tried his best to prove that they were anything but actors and has caused a great deal of confusion by insisting on an etymological interpretation of the passage in the *Mahābhāṣya*, has admitted that it should be translated

---

1 Levi, *Theatre Indien*, 1, p. 300. 2 The passage reads: ये तावदेते शौभनिका नामैते प्रत्यक्षं कंसं घातयन्ति प्रत्यक्षं बलिं बन्धयन्ति इति चित्रेषु कथम्! चित्रेष्वपि उद्गूर्णा निपातिताश्च प्रहारा दृश्यन्ते कंसकौण्यश्च। ग्रन्थिकेषु कथम्! यत्र शब्दगदुमार्गं लक्ष्यते तेऽपि हि तेषां उत्पत्तिप्रभूता विनाशात् कल्पितचिक्षाणा सतो बुद्धिविषयान् प्रकाशयन्ति। अतश्च सतो ख्यापिका हि दृश्यन्ते। केचित् कंसभक्ता भवन्ति केचिद् वसुदेवभक्ताः। वर्णान्यत्वं खल्वपि दृश्यन्ति। केचित् कालमुखा भवन्ति केचिद् रक्तमुखाः। 3 *SD*, pp. 31-36 "The obvious view, that of Weber, that we have a reference to a pantomimic killing and binding, seems irresistible". (p. 33). 4 *SD*, pp. 32-34.

by 'cave actress'. Now 'Sobhika' is, of course, the Prakrit form of 'Śaubhikā' the feminine form of 'Śaubhika'."[1]

According to Indian tradition as contained in the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, the origin of Indian drama is to be found in the request of Indra and other gods to create a fifth Veda for the Śūdras, who were debarred from a study of the four Vedas already existing.[2] The *Nāṭya Veda*, therefore, which was fashioned for all the castes, contains some features of the four Vedas—*viz.*, recitation from the *Ṛgveda*, music from the *Sāma Veda* gestures from the *Yajurveda*, and sentiments from the *Atharvaveda*. Both the *Gandharvas* and *Apsarases* took part in the play. The first play was staged on the occasion of a religious festival in honour of Indra's flag. This shows that Bharata also recognized to some extent popular elements in the Indian drama.

The use of Prakrit dialects in the Sanskrit drama is inexplicable on the hypothesis of purely religious origin of the Indian drama. On the contrary, purely secular origin is also untenable in view of the use of Sanskrit—both prose and verse, the innumerable references to some embryonic elements of the full-fledged drama in the *Ṛgveda*, and the influence of Brahmanism on the Indian drama. As already stated, in the *Mahāvrata* festival we get the first beginning of the real Indian drama. In the vile-tongued Brāhmaṇa of the festival, we have the origin of the Vidūṣaka of the classical dramas. The Buddhists, who were no admirers of Brahmanism, were fond of dramas and took much from the popular narrative literature, and their influence manifests the secular aspect of the Sanskrit drama. It seems, therefore, reasonable to conclude that two independent currents of the popular pastimes, secular

---

1 Ghosh, *MR*, December 1928, p. 593. Sukthankar (*JBRAS*, 1925, p. 127) also on the proof of Lüders, proposes the final abandonment of Weber's theory of mimic binding and killing. 2 Cf. *Nāṭyaśāstra*, 1, pp. 9-47 (GOS). On the analogy of Greece and Mexico where the origin of the drama is closely connected with phallic dances, Schroeder sees similar origin for Indian drama (*Mysterium und Mimus im Rgveda; VOJ*, xxii p. 223 ff; xxiii, p. 1 ff, 270f) for Gandharvas and Apsarases, who are connected with the origin of Indian drama according to the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, are a sort of phallic and erotic deities according to Schroeder: It is to be noted in this connection that there is no reference to phallic dances in ancient Indian literature. Ridgeway's theory as to the drama being the outcome of the reverence paid to the spirits of the dead, as observed by Dr. Keith, (*SD*, pp. 46-47) lacks proof.

and religious, gathaic and hymnic, patrician and plebian, united and by the interaction of the mutual influence produced the Sanskrit drama.[1]

The antiquity which we have assigned to Bhāsa's works is itself an answer to those scholars who find Greek origin for the Sanskrit drama. The theory of Greek origin is based on the wrong assumption that the *Mṛcch* is the oldest and the typical Indian drama ; but we have proved that it is an enlarged version of the *Cār* of Bhāsa. The similarities which are adduced to prove the Greek origin, such as the division of the play into five acts, the scenic conventions, the asides, entries and exits of the actors are but superficial and could very well have been developed independently in both the countries.[2] Konow has observed that the Greecian drama and the Indian drama are absolutely different in character. Greek drama offers no parallel to the use of the various dialects in the Sanskrit drama.[3] Some influence, no doubt, was inevitable when a closer contact grew between the two countries ; but that is quite a different thing. In the case of the Indian theatre we have already indicated that it shows no Hellenic influence. The similarity of the Indian theatre discovered in the Sitabenga Cave to the Greek theatre, in spite of Bloch's opinion, has been proved to be nominal and in no way convincing.[4]

TYPES OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

In this Section, all the main types of Sanskrit drama will be briefly referred to. The types of which we get instances in Bhāsa will be dealt with while considering each play.

Whatever view we take with regard to the origin of the Indian drama, it will have to be admitted that the first stage in the development of Sanskrit drama is represented by the one act types—*viz.*, *Bhāṇa*, *Vīthi*, *Aṅka*, *Prahasana* and *Vyāyoga*.[5] Out of these, *Bhāṇa*

---

1 Cf. Kulkarni, *Sanskrit Drama and Dramatists*, p. 10. 2 Cf. *MR*, Dec. 1928, pp. 595-596 ; Kulkarni, *Sanskrit Drama and Dramatists*, pp. 13-16. 3 *Ind. Drama*, pp. 40-41. 4 Konow, *Ind. Drama*, pp. 41 ; Hillebrandt, *Ind. Drama*, p. 28. 5 Definitions of the types of which we get illustrations in Bhāsa are given later on. Those that are not met with in Bhāsa's works are defined as under in the *Daśarūpa* :

the one-man drama, seems to be the earliest form of drama, as it is based only on monologues and deals only with the erotic sentiment. There are frequent 'speeches in the air', which make the otherwise monotonous representation, lively and interesting. *Vithi* followed *Bhāṇa*, as it has the number of characters and the number of sentiments increased. At present there are very few works extant of these types but some idea of them may be had from the narrative performances of the Kathakas of Bengal. *Prahasana* of the *śuddha* type may be taken to have been developed out of *Bhāṇa*. It is a farcical or comic satire on the vices of Brāhmaṇas or ascetics, and contains humorous speeches. *Hāsya* is the principal sentiment. The *saṅkīrṇa* type seems to have come later on, as the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* allows it to have two acts.[1] *Vyāyoga* appeared next, with the number of heroes increased up to ten. It excludes females participating in its representation (Cf. *Kāvyānuśāsana*, p. 323) on account of its military character and various kinds of fighting. It employs all

---

भाणस्तु धूर्तचरित स्वानुभूत परेण वा ।
वक्त्रापवर्गवेदेको निपुण: पण्डितो विट: ॥४६॥
सम्बोधनोक्तिभस्तुत्ती कुर्यादाकाशभाषितै: ।
सूच्यवेद्यैरन्यहारौ शौर्यसौभाग्यसंस्तवै: ॥५०॥
भूयसा भारती वृत्तिरेकाङ्क वस्तु कल्पितम् ।
मुखनिर्वहणे सन्धी तत्पात्राणि दशापि च ॥५१॥
तदत् प्रहसनं त्रेधा शुद्धवैकृतसंकरै: ।
पाखण्डिविप्रप्रभृतिचेटचेटीविटाकुलम् ॥५२॥
चेष्टितं वेषभाषाभि: शुद्धं हास्यवचोन्वितम् ।
कामुकादिवचोवेषै: कन्दकन्युक्तितापसै: ॥५५॥
विकृतं संकराद् वीथ्या संकीर्णं धूर्तसंकुलम् ।
रसस्तु भूयसा कार्य: षड्भिर्यो हास्य एव तु ॥५६॥
डिमे वस्तु प्रसिद्धं स्याद् वृत्तय: कैशिकीं विना ।
नेतारो देवगन्धर्वयक्षरक्षोमहोरगा: ॥५७॥
भूतप्रेतपिशाचाद्या: षोडशात्यन्तमुग्रता: ।
रसैरद्भुतशृङ्गारै: षड्भिरंकैश्च समन्वित: ॥५८॥
मायेन्द्रजालसंग्रामक्रोधोद्भ्रान्तादिचेष्टितै: ।
चन्द्रसूर्योपरागैश्च न्याय्ये रौद्ररसेऽङ्गिनि ॥५९॥
चतुरङ्कश्चतु:सन्धिर्निर्विमर्शो डिम: स्मृत: ।

1 *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, VI. 266-267. App. E, p. 103.

sorts of haughty *rasas*. *Aṅka* with its tragic note and wailings of women, shows a more developed stage than the *Vyāyoga*, and it had even two or three acts (*Bhāvaprakāśana*, p. 251). All these five one-act types had their actions spread over only a day and contained only two stages, *viz.*, *mukha* and *nirvahaṇa*—the *Vyāyoga* showing *pratimukha* as well. Different *vṛttis* were used in the types according as it suited the subject matter. *Īhāmṛga* is the natural extension of *Vyāyoga*, containing similar heroes, *rasas* and *vṛttis* with only this difference that in the former the union with the heroine is effected. The name, however, signifies the hard pursuit of the hero after a maiden, and hence one would naturally expect it to depict the topic of love. And the *Daśarūpa* allows a semblance of love on the part of the hero.[1] *Īhāmṛga* contains four acts, has three *sandhis*, and the action, if the number of acts is four, lasts for four days. *Dima* is also a variant of *Vyāyoga*. It represents terrific events, portents, incantations, sorcery, combats and disorders of every sort. It is called *Dima* because of the presence of *vidrava* (flight, panic, abuse) in it. *Dima* contains four acts, four *sandhis* and all *rasas* excepting erotic and humorous. *Samavakāra* is similar to *Dima* and *Vyāyoga*; but it has got the erotic element. Its definition indicates that *Samavakāra* was a very complicated affair and its natural development was *Nāṭaka*, the standard type. It had three acts, each succeeding one being shorter. Difficult metres were to be used in the *Samavakāra* and it had four *sandhis* excepting *vimarśa*. *Samavakāra* dealt with three varieties of *Śṛṅgāra*, with *Vīra* and *Raudra* as the prominent sentiments. It seems, the acts in the *Samavakāra* were not connected with one another. *Nāṭikā*, which Prof. Mankad takes to be derived from and later than the full-fledged drama, seems to be the intermediate stage between the *Samavakāra* and the *Nāṭaka*.[2] It is a love romance, its plot being either renowned like that of the *Nāṭaka* or invented by the poet like that of the *Prakaraṇa*. There are many females. It has four acts and four *sandhis* (except *vimarśa*). Love should be the main sentiment though it should also represent anger, conciliation, jealousy, hypocrisy, etc. The

1 Cf. Mankad, *Types of Sanskrit drama*, p. 59. 2 *Types of Sanskrit Drama*, p. 91.

palace intrigues, secret meetings with the heroine of the hero who is generally a gay king, the jealousy of the queen who is required to yield at the end, are some of the features of a *Nāṭikā*. It also includes profuse song and dance.

The definitions of the types of the drama in different works on dramaturgy came into existence after the composition of the actual dramatic works ; and the definitions mentioned the characteristics of the works existing in their times. It is, therefore, that we find in the definition of the *Nāṭikā* references to the *Nāṭaka* and the *Prakaraṇa* types of the *rūpakas*. *Nāṭaka*, the standard, perfect type contains all the *sandhis*, has the play of all the sentiments with *Śṛṅgāra* and *Vira* prominent ; hence it has recourse to all the *vṛttis*. The main *rasa* is supported by *bhāva*, *vibhāva*, *anubhāva*, etc. It has got a number of secondary incidents and *praveśakas*. There is no restriction as to the number of characters. The plot should be renowned, *i. e.*, taken from any standard work of the poet's time or it may depict the life-incidents of a king. Then there are five *arthaprakṛtis*, five *sandhis*, and five *avasthās*, into which the body of the plot is divided. There are given many qualifications of the hero, heroine, as also the different kinds of the openings of the dramas. The *Bhāvaprakāśana*, however, gives some latitude to the imagination of the poet in the plot ; and mentions five different divisions of *Nāṭaka* according to Subandhu, *viz.*, *Pūrṇa*, *Praśānta*, *Bhāsvara*, *Lalita* and *Samagra*, and definitions and instances of these types are given. It seems from this that Subandhu followed a different tradition.[1] *Prakaraṇa* is similar to *Nāṭaka* ; but its plot is imaginary and the life-story of a merchant or a minister or a Brāhmaṇa may be woven in it. There should not be an atmosphere of grandeur about the *Prakaraṇa* ; it is of the nature of a comedy portraying the manners of the people of the common strata in the society. *Prakaraṇa* is of two types : Śuddha, if the heroine is a *kulajā*, and *Saṅkīrṇa* if the heroine is a *veśyā*. The *kulajā* should use Sanskrit and the *veśyā*, Prakrit according to the *Bhāvaprakāśana* (p. 241). Love is its predominant subject. *Prakaraṇa*

1 *Bhāvaprakāśana*, *GOS*, No. 40, pp. 238–239.

is named from the hero or the heroine. There are also slaves, *viṭas*, and rogues of various kinds in the *Prakaraṇa*.

Prakaraṇikā, *Saṭṭaka*, *Troṭaka* and many others are minor *rūpakas*.

Now we shall deal with each play in our group in brief, giving its plot, type, sentiments, and offering our critical remarks at the end of each section. It is already stated that Bhāsa is credited with having written a work on dramaturgy. In these plays we get instances of *Vyāyoga*, *Samavakāra*, *Aṅka*, *Nāṭikā* or *Īhāmṛga*, *Nāṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa* (if the later acts of the *Cār* be unearthed). Probably Bhāsa may have written plays illustrating every type of the Sanskrit drama as defined in the texts of his time; and time may bring those works before us in future. We have stated that Bhāsa might have been the court-poet of some pre-Mauryan emperor. The one-act plays seem to have been written by the poet specially with the purpose of instructing the princes and impressing on their minds the importance of various virtues, heroism, religious observances, politics, etc. They were clearly written with didactic purpose.

DŪTAVĀKYA.

Title:—The play is named '*Dūtavākya*' as it deals with the advice *(vākya)* of Kṛṣṇa to Duryodhana as an emissary *(dūta)* of peace from the Pāṇḍavas.

Plot:—After reciting the *maṅgala-śloka* in praise of Upendra, the stage-manager is disturbed by a noise from behind the curtain, made by the chamberlain in proclaiming that His Majesty, Emperor Duryodhana, wanted to consult the princes in the Council Chamber with regard to the selection and appointment of the Commander-in-Chief of the Kaurava forces in the ensuing war for which all preparations were ready. Tents were pitched, armoury, arsenal, etc., were all equipped. After the elders and the princes are assembled and have taken their proper seats, Duryodhana puts the question as to who should lead the Kauravas, and on the suggestion of Śakuni, it is decided to crown the veteran Bhīṣma as the Commander. Just then the chamberlain enters with

the news that Puruṣottama Nārāyaṇa has arrived as an envoy from the Pāṇḍavas, at which Duryodhana warns the assembly not to pay any respect to the herdsman at the risk of a fine. He finds a way to insult Kṛṣṇa by engaging himself in looking at a picture scroll portraying the indignity offered to Draupadī by snatching her hair and apparel *(Draupadīkeśāmbarākarṣaṇa)*. The description shows the picture to be realistically and minutely painted. At the entry of Kṛṣṇa in the Chamber, all the assembly rises to honour him, and Duryodhana himself being confused falls from his throne. The picture-scroll is then taken away at the suggestion from Kṛṣṇa. When Kṛṣṇa tells Duryodhana about the message from Pāṇḍavas as to their share in the kingdom, the latter criticizes them severely, and both Kṛṣṇa and Duryodhana engage in some wordy war distinguished by severe sarcasm and a desire to inflict personal insult. Duryodhana orders his brothers, Śakuni and the kings assembled, to put Kṛṣṇa under arrest, but none dares obey him. So Duryodhana himself tries to bind Kṛṣṇa by nooses, but on Kṛṣṇa assuming cosmic forms all his efforts prove futile and impotent, and he walks away. Kṛṣṇa, however, becomes too much enraged and calls Sudarśana, his chief missile, to extirpate the Kauravas. Sudarśana appears on the stage in human form, pays homage to his master, and sets out to kill Duryodhana, but remembers the great divine cause of killing a host of sinners and tyrants and thus to lighten the burden of the earth, to be served by Kṛṣṇa and tells the latter about it. Kṛṣṇa is pacified and asks Sudarśana to go to his abode. Meanwhile all the other missiles of Kṛṣṇa, *viz.*, Śārṅga (his bow), Kaumodakī (his mace), Pāñcajanya, (his conchshell), and Nandaka (his sword), also appear on the stage and are told by Sudarśana to return to their respective places, as Kṛṣṇa was no longer wrathful and there was no necessity for the manifestation of their valour. After their departure, Garuḍa appears on the stage, but returns on being told of the pacification of Kṛṣṇa's anger. Sudarśana also follows Garuḍa. After Sudarśana has gone, Kṛṣṇa also sets out to go, but is detained by the old king Dhṛtarāṣṭra, who falls at his feet and thus honours the Lord. The usual epilogue brings the play to its close.

DEVIATIONS FROM THE ORIGINAL SOURCE.

Duryodhana is depicted as the real emperor in this drama, whereas Dhṛtarāṣṭra was the emperor in the epic. The drama has in the assembly no one besides the Kauravas, and Bhīṣma and Droṇa are mere figureheads therein; the epic, however, speaks of many persons attending the assembly and every one has his say. The picture-scroll and the appearance of the divine weapons are invented by the poet for stage effect. Kṛṣṇa and Duryodhana in the epic engage in long, monotonous dialogues, whereas their exchanges in the drama are more personal. Duryodhana is presented in the drama as a mighty warrior, a dignified emperor, thus quite in contrast to the epic where he is merely a wicked man.

Type of Drama. Dr. G. Sastri states that the play is either a *Vyāyoga* or a *Vithī*.[1] Dhanañjaya has defined *Vyāyoga* as (*Daśarūpa*, III. 60-61):

ख्यातेतिवृत्तो व्यायोगः ख्यातोद्धतनराश्रयः ॥
हीनो गर्भविमर्शाभ्यां दीप्तः स्युर्डिमवद्रसाः ।
अस्त्रीनिमित्तसंग्रामो जामदग्न्यजये यथा ॥

which indicates that the *Vyāyoga* had a renowned plot; the hero was renowned and haughty; haughty *rasas* were employed and the *sandhis* were void of *garbha* and *vimarśa*; the fighting must not have been caused by woman. The *Bhāvaprakāśana* suggests that there may be more heroes than one.[2] It may be noted that there is no real fight in this drama but only very feeble attempts by Duryodhana to bind Kṛṣṇa, which are utterly foiled by Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa. *Vithī* has been defined thus (*Daśarūpa*, III. 68-69):

वीथी तु कैशिकीवृत्ती सन्ध्यङ्गाङ्कैस्तु भाणवत् ॥
रसः सूच्यस्तु शृंगारः स्पृशेदपि रसान्तरम् ।
युक्ता प्रस्तावनाख्यातैरुद्घात्यकादिभिः ॥
एवं वीथी विधातव्या ह्येकपात्रप्रयोजिता ।

It speaks of the suggestion of *Śṛṅgāra* in the *Vithī*, whereas there is nothing of the kind in the *Dv*. The *Rasārṇava Sudhākara* even speaks of a heroine for the

1 *Dv*, p. 31. 2 *GOS*, No. 40, p. 248.

Vithi.[1] Thus we find that the *Dv* does not conform to the definition of *Vyāyoga* or *Vithī*; it may be classed under either of the two owing to its containing many of the characteristics of these types (बहूंगयोगात्) as stated by Dr. Sastri in the *Dv*. (p. 31). Something akin to these types may have been prevalent in Bhāsa's time of which we have neither any definition nor exact knowledge. We are inclined to class the *Dv* under a *Vyāyoga*.

Sentiments etc. *Vira* (the heroic) is the main sentiment, and the appearance of the divine weapons towards the close supplies with *Adbhuta* (the wonderful). The style is *Ārabhaṭī* (violent). Simple figures of speech are used of which *Sahokti* (6) and *Rūpaka* (14) may be mentioned. A number of similes are to be met with.

Critical remarks. There is no heroine in this play, nor any female character, nor is any Prakrit used. Dr. Winternitz suggests that the *Dv* is "only a fragment, one act taken from some longer *Mahābhārata* drama";[2] but the play is complete as it fulfills its purpose in the single act. It does not give the impression of being sketchy or of having something preceding and succeeding the piece. We do not think that the wickedness of Duryodhana is emphasized here; on the contrary he is shown in a favourable light as a comparison with the similar incidents in the epic will prove. Curiously enough, Mr. Meerwarth includes the *Dv*, along with the *Dgh* and the *Ūru* under "a tragical trilogy".[3] A stanza in the *Dv* gives us the political philosophy and the message of Bhāsa which deserves to be carved in letters of gold,—a guiding principle and a beacon-light that will stand the test of time; the message of freedom to countries in bondage, stating that kingdoms are earned and enjoyed by the strength of one's own arms and not by begging:

राज्यं नाम नृपात्मजैः सहृदयैर्जित्वा रिपून् भुज्यते
तल्लोके न तु याच्यते न तु पुनर्दीनाय वा दीयते।
काङ्क्षा चेन्नृपतित्वमाप्तुमचिरात् कुर्वन्तु ते साहसम्
स्वैरं वा प्रविशन्तु शान्तमतिभिर्जुष्टं शमायाश्रमम्॥

---

1 *TSS*. No. 50; Cf. Mankad *Types of Sanskrit drama*, p. 73. 2 *BRRI*. 5, p. 9. 3 *JASB*, 13, p. 274.

Foresight in the display of valour is praised in these words :

देशकालावस्थापेक्षि खलु शौर्यं नवानुगामिनाम् । (p. 18).

There are to be found many utterances having universal application in all these plays scattered everywhere. They are given in an alphabetical order towards the end of the book in an appendix. The various feats of Sudarśana remind one of Ariel in the *Tempest*. The divine weapons are further personified in the *Bāl* of this group. The recourse to *ākāśabhāṣita* enables the staging of the whole Kaurava assembly to be performed by a single actor who does all the talking. The consultation chamber may be shown by a transverse curtain while Kṛṣṇa is at the other end, or it may preferably be the inner apartment (*Raṅgaśīrṣa*) of the stage.

KARṆABHĀRA.

Title : Drs. T. Gaṇapati Sastri, Woolner and Sarup take the title to mean 'Karṇa's task or responsibility' referring to the generalship of Karṇa in the great Kuru war, and Dr. Sastri states that probably, at least one more act is necessary to describe the feats of Karṇa.[1] We, however, take the play to be complete in itself, and interpret the title as कर्णयोः भारभूतानि कुण्डलानि दत्त्वा कर्णेनापूर्वा दानशूरता प्रकटीकृता। तामधिकृत्य कृतं नाटकम्। During the interval of time that elapsed between the verbal gift of the *Kuṇḍalas* and their actual delivery, those *Kuṇḍalas* were felt as if a burden (*bhāra*) to his ears (*Karṇa*) by Karṇa. His selflessness, generosity and magnanimity rose to such an extent that the very moment he offered by word of mouth anything in gift to another it became the property of the latter and its presence with Karṇa was unbearable to him. Thus interpreted, Karṇa is presented in the most favourable light and there is no necessity to take the play as incomplete and infer the existence of a further act. The play simply informs us of the generous nature of the high-souled Karṇa and we have no further expectations raised by the play which remain to be fulfilled. The play thus is complete.

---

1 G. Sastri, TSS. No. 22, Preface. Woolner and Sarup, *Thirteen Trin. Plays*, Volume 2, p. 92.

Plot : The generalship of the Kaurava army falls on the shoulders of Karṇa after Droṇa. The stage-manager after his benedictory stanza hears some noise caused by the warrior messenger of Duryodhana telling Karṇa of the dreadful fight which is quite imminent and near at hand. Karṇa, however, is ready in his war-dress and is proceeding to the battle-field with Śalya ; so the messenger makes his exit as there is no necessity to deliver the message. Karṇa is in a gloomy mood. He asks Śalya to drive the chariot to the place where Arjuna is. But at the moment he is held back by the memory of the fact of Pāṇḍavas being his younger brothers. He then tells Śalya the story of his learning the various *astras* (weapons) from Paraśurāma under the pretext of being a Brahmaṇa. One day while he (Karṇa) had gone to the forest to bring fuel, fruit, etc., his preceptor fell asleep on his lap. A worm bored a hole through his thigh but he did not make any movement lest his preceptor might get disturbed in his sleep. The cold blood, however, oozing out from the thigh awakened Paraśurāma, who became angry after learning the true state of affairs, and cursed him that his *astras* would fail him at the time of need. Karṇa now wants to test his knowledge but finds it fruitless. In his grief he invokes peace and blessings to all, and asks Śalya again to drive the chariot to the battle-field, but is stopped by a Brāhmaṇa mendicant who begs a big boon from Karṇa. Karṇa offers him in turn cows, horses, elephants, the whole earth, the fruit of *Agniṣṭoma*, and even his person, but the Brahmaṇa refuses all, and demands the natural armour of Karṇa. Śalya seeing through the deceit of Indra sounds a note of warning, but Karṇa after stating that the sacrificial merits and gifts alone are permanent in this transient world, satisfies the Brāhmaṇa who is really Indra in disguise. Indra makes his exit after receiving the armour, but in return sends Vimalā, a Śakti, through his servant to Karṇa ; and the latter accepts it only because it proceeds from a Brāhmaṇa. Then Karṇa ascends his chariot, and asks Śalya to drive it to the battle-field. The usual epilogue concludes the play.

Deviations. In the epic, the incident of Indra getting the armour from Karṇa occurs earlier while the

Pāṇḍavas were in the forest ; the poet has transferred the incident to the battle-field to make it more touching. Karṇa in the *Karṇa* is depicted as more noble ; he demands nothing in return from Indra. Salya in the *Karṇa* is sympathetic towards Karṇa ; he is not intent on insulting the latter or contradicting him and thus making him lose heart, as stated in the epic.

Type. The play cannot be a *Vyāyoga*, as there is no fight and no *Vira rasa*. It may be classed under *Utsṛṣṭikāṅka*, which is thus defined (*Daśarūpa*, III. 70-72) :

उत्सृष्टिकाङ्के प्रख्यातं वृत्तं युद्ध्वा प्रपञ्चयेत् ॥
रसस्तु करुणः स्थायी नेतारः प्राकृता नराः ।
भाषावस्त्रिवृत्त्यङ्कैर्युक्तः स्त्रीपरिदेवितैः ॥
वाचा युद्धं विधातव्यं तथा जयपराजयौ ।

There are no wailings of women in the *Karṇa* as required in an *Utsṛṣṭikāṅka* ; but, as already stated, Bhāsa's works do not conform in every minute detail to the definitions given in our extant texts on dramaturgy.

Sentiments etc. There is a pathetic note (*karuṇa*) pervading the whole play. The whole atmosphere is serene and serious, relieved to some extent by a high class character (Indra in the disguise of a begging (Brāhmaṇa) speaking Prakrit and his peculiar mannerisms, which supply some sort of humour (*Hāsya*). The poet has thus purposely used Prakrit in the mouth of a Brāhmaṇa to relieve the tension and hence there is nothing peculiar or 'curious' in it.[1] The simile comparing the heroic Karṇa overwhelmed with grief with the sun covered by clouds is very finely expressed. (v. 4 :).

अत्युग्रदीप्तिविगदः समरेऽप्रगल्भः
शौर्ये च सम्प्रति सशोकमुपैति धीमान् ।
प्राप्ते निदाघसमये घनराशिरुद्धः
सूर्यः स्वभावरुचिमानिव भाति कर्णः ॥

Critical remarks. This is the shortest play in the group. It has no female characters. After considering the conception of tragedy in the Greek and Shakespearean sense, Prof. Ramachandra Rao has included the *Karṇa*

1 Cf. Winternitz, *BRRI*, 5, p. 4. It is to be noted in this connection that the soliloquies of Sakra are all in Sanskrit.

among the few Indian dramas that he styles tragedies.[1] But the *Karṇa* is not a tragedy. The notion is due to the misinterpretation of the title. The *Karṇa* means and emphasizes, as stated above, the particular aspect of Karṇa's character, viz. his magnanimity. It does not mean 'Karṇa's task', and hence there is no necessity to show Karṇa's death or even to refer to it at all. The pathetic element accentuates the liberality of Karṇa. The drama is complete in itself. It serves its purpose after Karṇa is shown in a favourable light. In its interpretation as "Karṇa's task", the play fails to create any impression whatsoever about Karṇa's task : much less can it be taken to be incomplete. Thus, 'the burden of (Karṇa's) ears' is the only correct interpretation. Bhāsa has shown similar subtlety of meaning in naming one of his plays as the *Pratimā*. The play was primarily written for didactic purpose, possibly to impress on the minds of the princes the importance of generosity. The air of Brahmin superiority is found pervading this short piece also. Karṇa's dictum that everything else (even good learning, firmly footed trees, and fountains of water) vanishes but sacrifices and charities live to the end is finely expressed in v. 22 ;

शिक्षा क्षयं गच्छति कालपर्ययात्
सुबद्धमूला निपतन्ति पादपाः।
जलं जलस्थानगतं च शुष्यति
हुतं च दत्तं च तथैव तिष्ठति॥

The ideal to be aimed at and striven for by every wearer of the crown is beautifully described by Karṇa in v. 17 :

धर्मो हि यत्नैः पुरुषेण साध्यो
भुजङ्गजिह्वाचपला नृपश्रियः।
तस्मात् प्रजापालनमात्रबुद्धया
हृतेषु देहेषु गुणा धरन्ते॥

Dr. Winternitz states that "the Karṇa of the *Mahābhārata* is a far more interesting figure than that of our one-act play";[2] but in this connection it should be borne in mind that the *Karṇa*, along with all the plays of our group, is to be considered from the point of view of the spectators

1 Paper read at the Mysore Oriental Conference. The Professor kindly supplied me with a copy of the paper. 2 *BRRI*, 5, p. 7.

of that period as well as from the 'Indian' point of view which is essentially of a devotional character. The colophon '*Kavacāṅka Nāṭaka*' of another manuscript[1] gives the alternate title of the play, lending additional support to the interpretation of the title '*Karṇabhāra*' as suggested by us. The word *Aṅka* in '*Kavacāṅka*' possibly stands for the *Utsṛṣṭikāṅka* tpye of *rūpaka* and it is well known that the scribes read their own types of dramas in the earlier plays.

DŪTAGHAṬOTKACA.

Title: The play speaks of Ghaṭotkaca as an envoy *(dūta)* carrying the message of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to the Kauravas.

Plot: The stage-manager after the benedictory stanza is disturbed by the sound of a soldier who is out to inform Dhṛtarāṣṭra of the ruthless murder of Abhimanyu by the Kauravas, while Arjuna was engaged in fighting with the Saṁśaptakas. Dhṛtarāṣṭra protests against the wickedness of Abhimanyu's death, and on hearing that Jayadratha was the chief culprit, exclaims that Jayadratha is now no more; Duḥśalā weeps at it and prepares to wear the widow's weeds. Dhṛtarāṣṭra tells Gāndhārī to make ready to go to the sacred Ganges to offer funeral oblations to their sons, who were sure to meet their deaths at the hands of the Pāṇḍavas. Then enter Duryodhana, Duḥśāsana and Śakuni overjoyed and delighted at the death of Abhimanyu and their consequent victory. In spite of the protests from Śakuni, Duryodhana goes with Duḥśāsana to pay respects to Dhṛtarāṣṭra but the latter does not pronounce the usual blessings. Asked the reason, Dhṛtarāṣṭra states that it is impossible to give blessings to those who have left off all the hopes of their lives, have ruthlessly slaughtered a child dearer than their lives to Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna, and sarcastically speaks of the gift of widowhood by hundred brothers to their only sister. He futher tells Duryodhana of the valorous deeds of Arjuna, but Duryodhana tries to argue the matter with his father, and a wordy war proceeds when a thundrous noise is heard from the enemies' camp, which later on proves to be the outburst

1 TSS, No. 22, p. 85 n1. The MS is named ख.

of joy at Arjuna's oath to kill Jayadratha. Duryodhana says that he would cover Jayadratha under his mighty forces led by Droṇa and make the enemies enter the flames of fire in their disappointment. Dhṛtarāṣṭra retorts that even if he enter the entrails of the earth or ascend the aerial regions, the arrows guided by Kṛṣṇa will follow him everywhere. Then enters Ghaṭotkaca as an envoy from Kṛṣṇa. Unmindful of the insulting language of Duryodhana, the envoy approaches Dhṛtarāṣṭra, conveys to him the respects of the Paṇḍavas and of himself, and begins to deliver the message of Kṛṣṇa, at the mere mention of whose name, Dhṛtarāṣṭra tries to rise from his seat to honour the Lord. In view of the excessive grief to which Arjuna was subjected owing to the death of his single son, the Lord asks Dhṛtarāṣṭra to prepare himself and make his mind strong and firm to bear calmly the impending deaths of his hundred sons. Duryodhana, however, taunts the envoy and the latter suitably replies to him. Ghaṭotkaca tells Duryodhana of the lightening of the burden of the earth through the destruction of the vile princes. Śakuni and Duḥśāsana also speak slightly with disrespect of Kṛṣṇa and Ghaṭotkaca and call themselves as cruel and as hard-hearted as the Rākṣasas, to which Ghaṭotkaca returns that they are more cruel than the Rākṣasas.[1] Duryodhana refers to the immunity of Ghaṭotkaca being an envoy, which enrages Ghaṭotkaca who throws out a challenge to all and prepares to fight with them all single-handed. Fearing another child-murder, Dhṛtarāṣṭra intervenes and pacifies Ghaṭotkaca. Asked about the reply to be carried back to Kṛṣṇa, Duryodhana says that his arrows would serve as the reply. Then Ghaṭotkaca sets out to go back after saying good-bye to Dhṛtarāṣṭra ; he, however, does not leave without uttering the final message of Kṛṣṇa, which is nothing but the threat of vengeance by Arjuna on the following day. There is no *Bharatavākya*.

Deviations. The embassy of Ghaṭotkaca is invented by the poet. All the other characters and incidents are to be met with in the epic.

Type of Drama. As observed by Dr. G. Sastri the

---

1 *Dyā* st. 47 recounts the misdeeds of the Kauravas which Ghaṭotkaca says that even the Rākṣasas are incapable of committing.

play is neither a comedy nor a tragedy and ends abruptly.[1] The absence of the *Bharatavākya* suggests that perhaps the poet might have added something more towards the end which is now lost. Dr. Keith classifies this play under a *Vyāyoga*, and some features of that variety are found in our play.[2] But we think the *Dgh* answers more closely the characteristics of an *Utsṛṣṭikāṅka*. The main sentiment is *Karuṇa*; there are the wailings of women and there is fight as well as victory and defeat by speech only as enjoined by the *Daśarūpa*.[3] The colophon reads '*Dūtaghaṭotkacāṅkam*' in common with '*Kavacāṅkam*', and possibly denotes an *Utsṛṣṭikāṅka*.

Sentiment etc. The main sentiment is pathetic (*Karuṇa*) which is evidenced by the speeches of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Gāndhārī and Duhśalā. Subsequent to the entry of Ghaṭotkaca, there is a play of the martial spirit (*Vīra*) but the tragic note is felt everywhere. The style is grand (Sātvatī) and violent (ārabhaṭī).

Critical remarks. The play has been criticized as a patchwork,[4] but its purpose, in common with all the *Mbh* plays of our group, is mainly didactic, to impress on the minds of the spectators the virtues of heroism, and god-fearing nature, and the omnipotence of Kṛṣṇa. The unbounded joy felt by Duryodhana and others is beautifully contrasted with the portentious presentiments, doubts, and fears of Dhṛtarāṣṭra; the treatment accorded to Ghaṭotkaca is also different in both these cases. The answer which Dhṛtarāṣṭra gives to Duryodhana's pretensions is at once brief, complete, telling and sarcastic (v. 16). Thrice is the passion-interest pitched to the high limit and thrice a different turn given to such incidents. There is exchange of fiery words between the father and the son, and Dhṛtarāṣṭra's last words (v. 24) contain references to Śakuni, and the latter's replies thereto would have given the conversation a serious turn; at that very moment some noise is heard behind the curtain. Secondly, Ghaṭotkaca's entry is effected after Dhṛtarāṣṭra addresses such words to Duryodhana (v. 31)

---

1 T.S.S., No. 22, preface. 2 *SD*, p. 96. 3 III. 70-72 quoted above in the *Karṇa*. For *Utsṛṣṭikāṅka*, cf. also *Kāvyānuśāsana*, Nirnayasagar Press, p. 324; *Bhāvaprakāśana*. GOS No. 40, p. 251; *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, GOS No. 48. p. 130; Mankad, *Types of Sanskrit Drama*, pp. 39, 61-62, 79-80. 4 Winternitz, *BRRI*, 5, p. 8.

as, even according to the warrior (*bhaṭa*), would render another person liable to lose his life at the hands of Duryodhana (v. 32). Finally, when Ghaṭotkaca is too much enraged and is ready to fight with all the Kauravas, Dhṛtarāṣṭra pleads with him to restrain himself. Is any Kerala plagiarist capable of such dramatic sense and psychological outlook? Dr. Winternitz says that "the message of Kṛṣṇa which he [*i e.* Ghaṭotkaca] brings in the final verse (taking the place of *Bharatavākya*) is quite out of place".[1] But this is not so. Ghaṭotkaca delivers the message of Kṛṣṇa to Dhṛtarāṣṭra (p. 65) to which a reference is already made above. The next message is to Duryodhana (v. 43, p. 67) and finally to all the Kauravas, the first part of which serves as being capable of universal application. Janārdana enjoins all the kings to follow the rules of righteous conduct:

धर्मं समाचर गुरु (read कुरु) स्वजनव्यपेक्षां
यत् कांक्षितं मनसि सर्वमिहानुतिष्ठ।
(v. 52).

The drama, no doubt, ends abruptly and the last verse, as stated by Dr. Winternitz, is "quite out of place;" this may be due to the mangling by some Cākyār, into whose hands these plays fell.

ŪRUBHAṄGA.

Title. The smashing *(bhaṅga)* of the thighs *(ūru)* of Duryodhana in the club-fight is described in this drama and hence the title is most appropriate.

Plot. Three warriors enter the stage after the stage-manager has finished his preliminaries and between themselves give a detailed description of the battle-field on the eighteenth day of the great Kuru War. The whole battle-ground was full of corpses and of jackals and vultures gathered to eat flesh from the dead bodies. Some noise is heard behind the curtain which is identified later on as that produced by the terrible mace-fight between Bhīma and Duryodhana. The warriors turn their paces to the place where the club-fight is going on in the presence of Vyāsa, Vidura, Balarāma and Kṛṣṇa. They then describe the fight very realistically. In the opinion of

---

1 *BRRI*, 5, p. 8.

the second warrior, Bhīma was physically stronger while Duryodhana was more adept in the club-fight (v. 19 संशिक्षितो नरपतिर्बलवांस्तु भीमः). In the fight later on, Bhīma gets a terrible blow on his head and falls down, which plunges the Paṇḍava supporters into anxieties, and gladdens Balarāma at the victory of his disciple. Duryodhana then taunts Bhīma by telling him not to be afraid, as he was not going to kill him, though his life was at his (Duryodhana's) mercy. Seeing this, Kṛṣṇa makes a secret sign to Bhīma by striking on his own thighs. This infuses a new spirit in Bhīma and he rises up energetically quite fresh for fighting anew after a loud thundering shout. After fighting for some time, Bhīma hurls his mace with both hands on the thighs of Duryodhana contrary to the established rules of club-fight in accordance with Kṛṣṇa's sign. Duryodhana's thighs are broken and bleed profusely and he falls to the ground. At his fall, Vyāsa sets out to fly to the heavens and Balarāma becomes enraged at the unjust treatment accorded to Duryodhana; but on Vyāsa's advice Bhīma is led elsewhere by the Paṇḍavas helped by Kṛṣṇa. Balarāma opens the next scene, shouting loudly that he is going to kill Bhīma, and asking Duryodhana to hold on a little longer. Hearing this, Duryodhana crawls in with great effort as his thighs are broken, and tries to pacify Balarāma by saying, "Let the offerers of funeral oblations live and let strifes and enmities vanish." v. 31

जीवन्तु ते कुरुकुलस्य निवापमेघाः
वैरं च विग्रहकथा च वयं च नष्टाः।

But instead Balarāma becomes more enraged and talks of killing all the Paṇḍavas. Duryodhana, however, shows saintly resignation saying it was no use fighting in his the then circumstances (v. 33) and that it was not Bhīma, but the great Lord Kṛṣṇa who had deceived him; Kṛṣṇa had entered as it were Bhīma's mace and made present of his (Duryodhana's) life to the God of death (v. 35)[1]

तीव्रां भीमगदां प्रविश्य सहसा निर्व्याजयुद्धप्रिय-
स्तेनाहं जगतः प्रियेण हरिणा मृत्योः परिग्राहितः॥

---

1 Drs. Woolner and Sarup declare this verse and the three dialogues preceding it (*Dgh*, T.S.S. No. 22, p. 99) as later additions. *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*. Volume 2, p. 52 n 1.

Then enter Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Gāndhārī, the queens of Duryodhana, and his son Durjaya, all bewailing his sad lot and searching for him on the battle-field. All this pains Duryodhana to the most, more poignant than his physical injuries. The sight of his queens crying aloud, walking on foot and bare-headed, without their usual veils, strikes a serious blow to Duryodhana (p. 101) :

भोः ! कष्टम् । पन्नमापि स्त्रियो रुदन्ति ।

पूर्वं न जानामि गदाभिघात-
रुजामिदानीं तु समर्थयामि ।
यन्मे प्रकाशीकृतमूर्धजानि
रथं प्रविष्टान्यवरोधनानि ॥३८॥

More is yet to come. At the approach of his parents and at the express desire of his father to salute him, Duryodhana tries to get up to fall at the feet of his father but falls down again (p. 102) धृतराष्ट्रः—एहि पुत्र ! अभिवादयस्व माम् ।

राजा—अयमयमागच्छामि । (उत्थानं रूपयित्वा पतति) हा धिक् ! अयं मे द्वितीयः प्रहारः । कष्टं भोः !

हतं मे भीमसेनेन गदापातकचग्रहे ।
सममूरुद्वयेनाद्य गुरोः पादाभिवन्दनम् ॥४१॥

The scene between Duryodhana and Durjaya is the most pathetic, the most touching, in the whole range of Sanskrit literature and no apology is needed to quote the whole scene in extenso owing to its bringing out the inner traits of Duryodhana, and showing him in the light in which the poet wants us to see Duryodhana. The dialogues between the father and the son are most touching and heart-rending. The whole scene bears the stamp of the master who has created the garden-scene or the dream-scene in the *Svapna*.[1]

धृतराष्ट्रः—क एष भोः ! मम वक्षान्तमाकर्षन् मार्गमादेशयति ।
दुर्जयः—ताद ! अहं दुज्जओ ।
धृतराष्ट्रः—पौत्र ! दुर्जय ! पितरमन्विच्छ ।
दुर्जयः—परिस्सन्तो खु अहं ।
धृतराष्ट्रः—गच्छ, पितुरङ्के विश्रमयिष्यसि ।
दुर्जयः—ताद ! अहं गच्छामि । (उपसृत्य) ताद ! कहिं सि ।

राजा—अये अयमप्यागतः । सर्वावस्थायां हृदयसन्निहितः पुत्रस्नेहो मां दहति । कुतः,

---

1 Cf. *JASB*, 17, p. 275.

दुःखानामनभिज्ञेयो ममाङ्कशयनोचितः।
निर्जितं दुर्जयो दृष्ट्वा किन्नु मामभिधास्यति ॥४२॥

दुर्जयः—अअं महाराओ सूमीए उवविट्ठो।
राजा—पुत्र! किमर्थमागतः।
दुर्जयः—तुवं चिरायसि त्ति।
राजा—अहो अस्यामवस्थायां पुत्रस्नेहो हृदयं दहति।
दुर्जयः—अहं पि खु दे अङ्के उवविसामि। (अङ्कमारोहति)
राजा—(निवार्य) दुर्जय! दुर्जय! भोः! कष्टम्।
हृदयप्रीतिजननो यो मे नेत्रोत्सवः स्वयम्।
सोऽयं कालविपर्यासाच्चन्द्रो वह्निरुमागतः ॥४३॥
दुर्जयः—अङ्के उवविसं किणिमित्तं तुवं वारेसि।
राजा— त्यक्त्वा परिच्छदं पुत्र! यत्र तत्र त्वयास्यताम्।
अद्यप्रभृति नास्तीदं पूर्वभुक्तं तवासनम् ॥४४॥
दुर्जयः—कहिं खु खु महाराओ गमिस्सदि।
राजा—भ्रातृशतमनुगच्छामि।
दुर्जयः—मं पि तहिं णेहि।
राजा—गच्छ पुत्र! वृकोदरं ब्रूहि।
दुर्जयः—एहि महाराअ! अण्णेसीअसि।
राजा—पुत्र! केन?
दुर्जयः—अय्याए, अय्येण, सव्वेहि अन्तउरेहि अ।
राजा—गच्छ पुत्र! नाहमागन्तुं समर्थः।
दुर्जयः—अहं तुवं घेत्तस्सम्।
राजा—बालस्त्वमसि पुत्र!

(*Urubhanga*, T.S.S. No. 22, pp. 103-106)

His inability to offer his lap as a resting place for his beloved son is the unkindest cut of all to Duryodhana. The sorry plight of Duryodhana reminds Dhṛtarāṣṭra of the deaths of his hundred sons, and the old man falls down unconscious. Duryodhana requests him to console his mother by telling her that her son died in the war without showing his back (p. 107 अपराङ्मुखो युधि हतः।) and that he is dying in the same dignity in which he was born (v. 47 येनैव मानेन समं प्रसूतस्तेनैव मानेन दिवं प्रयामि।). His love for his mother is brilliantly shown by his prayer to be her son in all his future lives if there be any slight merit to his credit (v. 50 : .... यदि पुण्यं मया कृतम्।
अन्यस्यामपि जात्यां मे त्वमेव जननी भव ॥

His message to his queens also is not to lament for him as he is meeting with the hero's death, having performed in all earnest his duties of the kingly office, and he

is dying heroically. His parting advice to his son also is worthy of the great hero ; he preaches reconciliations ; his enmity with the Pāṇḍavas gives place to a sort of repentance and purification of the soul (pp. 109-110 ; also अहो वैरं पश्चात्तापः संवृत्तः ।) Aśvatthāman then enters the stage, making a big sound with his bow, all wrathful at the news of the condition of Duryodhana. To his query, Duryodhana replies that his condition is due to his discontent (p. 112 फलमपरितोषस्य ।) but Aśvatthāman declares his intention of slaying the Pāṇḍavas and Kṛṣṇa, and Duryodhana tries to dissuade him saying that it is now of no use after the loss of his brothers, Karṇa and others, in his present condition to revive enmity. Aśvatthāman however, tells him that it appears as if his dignity *(māna)* has been killed along with his thighs ; but Duryodhana silences him by saying that *māna* is the life of the king and it was for *māna* alone that he fought. The evils wrought by the Pāṇḍavas are nothing as campared to his treatment of the Pāṇḍavas. All this fails to convince and satisfy Aśvatthāman who takes a vow, with Balarāma as a witness, to fight with the Pāṇḍavas and crown Durjaya as the emperor. Duryodhana feels satisfied at this and then gets a vision of his ancestors at his death. His body is covered with a piece of cloth after his death. Then Dhṛtarāṣṭra in his grief declares his intention of going to the forests for penance and Asvatthāman starts to kill the Paṇḍavas in their sleep with upraised weapon. The general praise by all for the protection of the earth by " our king " after destroying his enemies brings the drama to a close.

Deviations : The poet has changed the whole conception of Duryodhana's character. Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Gāndhārī, the queens of Duryodhana, and Durjaya, his son, who were miles away at Hastināpura are brought on the battle-field to enhance the pathos and for dramatic effect. Balarāma was not present at the club-fight according to the epic, and Arjuna made the secret sign to Bhīma and not Kṛṣṇa as told in the drama.[1] The coronation of Durjaya is also an invention of the poet.

Type of drama : It has been suggested that the

---

1 *Mahābhārata*, IX. 58. 21 ; *Ūru* p. 94 : स्वमूरुमभिहत्य कामपि सैवां प्रयच्छति जनार्दनः ।

play may be classified under a *Vyāyoga*; but with Drs. Winternitz and G. Sastri, we think that it falls under an *Utsṛṣṭikāṅka*, which as suggested by Dr. Winternitz, may mean "*Bāṣpotsṛṣṭikāṅka*, 'a one-act piece causing discharge (of tears)'.[1] The *Kāvyānuśāsana* (p. 324) explains the term as meaning "one which is characterized by women who are grieving, *i. e.* whose sight, life, and breath are about to flee away (उत्क्रमणोन्मुखा दृष्टिर्जीवितं प्राणा यासां ता उत्सृष्टिकाः शोचयन्तः स्त्रियस्ताभिरङ्कित इति तथोक्तः।)".[2] All the characteristics of an *Utsṛṣṭikāṅka* stated by different works on dramaturgy are found to exist in the *Ūru*. Thus *e. g.*, the plot is renowned, the hero is an ordinary person, the chief sentiment is *Karuṇa*, and it is full of the wailing of women. The style is *sātvatī* and *ārabhaṭī*. The *Ūru* violates the rule as to the death of the hero on the stage.

Sentiments etc. The main sentiment pervading the play is pathos *(Karuṇa)*. *Vīra* also is brought in when describing the fight between Duryodhana and Bhīma. The descriptions of the battle-field, etc. contain many similes and metaphors. The comparison of the battle with a sacrifice is elaborately worked out (v. 6). The battle-field is similarly compared with the hermitage of the Kṣatriyas (v. 4); the female jackals with female relations in marriage (v. 9): and so on.

Critical remarks: In a separate section it is shown earlier that the *Ūru* is a real tragedy. Prof. Ramachandra Rao also endorses the same view but he includes the *Karṇa* and the *Veṇī* under the list.[3] That the *Karṇa* cannot be called a tragedy in so far as the complete piece as we have it is concerned, is dealt earlier in this chapter. We do not adhere to the opinion that Duryodhana is the hero of the *Veṇī*; it is Bhīma. Further, the differences in the conception of the characteristics of Duryodhana as stated by Bhāsa and Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa are sufficient to prove that the *Veṇī* is not intended as a tragedy. As observed by us elsewhere, "*Veṇī* in reality is a suppressed tragedy."[4] We have

1 G. Sastri, TSS No. 22, preface; Winternitz, *BBRI*, 5, p. 6, also n. 16. 2 Mankad, *Types of Sanskrit Drama*, p. 61. The definition as given in the *Daśarūpa* (III. 70-72) has been quoted above in the *Karṇa*. See also *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, VI. 245 (p. 100); *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, GOS, No. 48, p. 131. 3 Paper read at the Mysore Oriental Conference. 4 *JUB*, 2, p. 185.

sufficiently brought out all the relieving factors in the character of Duryodhana as conceived by Bhāsa, which show that Duryodhana was a noble emperor, an ideal son, husband, and father. The description of the actual battle by triads reminds one of the similar devices used in the *Pañc* and the *Abh*; the description is very realistic presenting the picture of the actual fight before our eyes. The various similes and metaphors employed in describing the different aspects of the battle-field, the corpses, the creatures there, etc., are also true to life.

MADHYAMA-VYĀYOGA.

Title. The title *Madhyama-Vyāyoga* can be interpreted in three ways, *viz.*, मध्यममधिकृत्य कृतो व्यायोगसंज्ञो नाट्यप्रकारः; मध्यम (भीम) स्य (हिडिम्बया सह) व्यायोगः (वि+आ+योग=विशेषेण संयोगः); मध्यमौ (भीमो ब्राह्मणकुमारश्च) व्यायुज्येते अस्मिन् इति नाटकम्। The last interpretation meaning "the work where two Madhyamas are brought together" appears to be better.

Plot. The stage-manager after reciting the benedictory stanza in praise of Viṣṇu hears some noise, which on second hearing proves to be the speech of an old Brāhmaṇa with his wife and sons, who all are being harassed by the demon Ghaṭotkaca. The stage-manager then leaves the stage after thus introducing the main characters. The old Brāhmaṇa and his three sons surprised and alarmed at their pursuit describe the half-human, half-demonic Ghaṭotkaca. Ghaṭotkaca speaks of his peculiarly awkward position—his respect for the Brāhmaṇas and the command of his mother to bring a person for her dinner; but he decides to carry out the command of his mother. The Brāhmaṇa family after a talk among themselves come to learn of the absence of four of the Pāṇḍavas from their hermitage which was nearby and also of Bhīma's being in the forest to take physical exercise. Thus seeing no way out of the difficulty, they approach the demon and ask him if there was any means of escape. He agrees to take only one of them and let go the rest. Then follows a discussion among the members of the family as to who should sacrifice himself for the sake of the family. The old man and his wife who offer themselves are ruled out by Ghaṭotkaca on the ground of old age and female sex respectively. Among

the three sons the father wants the eldest, the mother wants the youngest ; so the choice falls on the middle one, who is very glad to be able to serve the whole family. With the permission of the demon, the middle one goes to quench his thirst to a lake in the vicinity. But he does not return soon, and Ghaṭotkaca becomes impatient as it was growing late for his mother's dinner. On learning of the name of the middle one from the eldest son, Ghaṭotkaca shouts by his name " Madhyma ! Madhyama ! Come quickly ! ". Bhīma (who was also a Madhyama) is nearby, engaged in exercise, and he hears his name being called and wonders who it might be that disturbed him in his exercise. On getting no response, Ghaṭotkaca shouts louder and louder and Bhīma stands before him in answer to his call, telling him that he (*i. e.* Bhīma) was Madhyama by name. The Brāhmaṇa y o u t h, Madhyama, also makes his appearance shortly afterwards. The old Brāhmaṇa requests Bhīma to protect his son, and Bhīma salutes him and promises his help. After his talk with the old Brāhmaṇa and the demon, Bhīma recognizes the demon as his own son. Bhīma orders Ghaṭotkaca to release the Brāhmaṇa youth, but meets with a blank refusal, and then he offers himself to accompany Ghaṭotkaca instead of the Brāhmaṇa's son. Bhīma agrees to be taken by force if Ghaṭotkaca had the power ; otherwise he expresses his willingness to follow the latter peacefully. Ghaṭotkaca prepares to fight and throws a big tree and a mountain top at Bhīma but these have no effect. Then they engage in a hand to hand fight in which Ghaṭotkaca has to own defeat. Ghaṭotkaca further tries as a last resource to bind Bhīma by the magic noose given by his mother, but this also proves futile. Finding force of no avail, Ghaṭotkaca falls back on Bhīma's offer to accompany him of his own accord. All go to Hiḍimbā's residence and she appears on the stage on being called by her son. Hiḍimbā at once recognizes her husband and asks her son to fall at the feet of his father, Bhīma. She explains to Bhīma her motive in asking Ghaṭotkaca to bring a man for her dinner, which was to bring back Bhīma h i m s e l f. Ghaṭotkaca salutes the Brāhmaṇas, who then leave for their further journey escorted to the door by Bhīma, his wife and son. The *Bharatavākya* brings the play to its close.

Deviations. The whole story is practically the poet's invention. The epic does not speak of Bhīma's meeting with Hiḍimbā. All the Pāṇḍavas are sent by the poet to attend a sacrifice. To the main story of Bhīma-Hiḍimbā is tagged the subsidiary episode (*patākā*) of the Brāhmaṇa family with three sons vying with each other for getting the chance to make a sacrifice for the whole family. The latter episode was, as already stated, suggested by the *Śunahśepākhyāna* in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (cf. also *Manusmṛti*, IX. 105-109).

Type of drama. Southern scribes of the MSS of Bhāsa's plays describe the *Mv* as a *Vyāyoga*. Prof. Mankad, however, states that it is not a *Vyāyoga* since reunion is effected in the play ; and he suggests the play to be an *Īhāmṛga*.[1] But it does not conform to the definition of an *Īhāmṛga*, which is thus defined in the *Daśarūpa* (III. 72-75) :

मिश्रमीहामृगे वृत्तं चतुरङ्कं त्रिसन्धिमत् ॥
नरदिव्यावनिषमाद्यावकप्रतिनायकौ ।
ख्यातौ धीरोद्धतावन्त्यो विपर्यासाद्युतकृत् ॥
दिव्यस्त्रियमनिच्छन्तीमपहारादिनेच्छतः ।
शृङ्गाराभासमप्यस्य किञ्चित्किञ्चित्प्रदर्शयेत् ॥
संरम्भं परमानीय युद्धं व्याजाच्चिवारयेत् ।
वधप्राप्तस्य कुर्वीत वधं नैव महात्मनः ॥

The fighting in an *Īhāmṛga* seems to have been caused by a woman while in a *Vyāyoga* it is अस्त्रीनिमित्तसंग्राम ; further, an *Īhāmṛga* is said to contain also four acts (*Sāhityadarpaṇa*, VI. 245 ; *Daśarūpa*, III. 72 ; *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, p. 131) ; so it seems better to style the play as a *Vyāyoga*.

Sentiment etc. The main sentiment is *Vīra* ; and various other sentiments go to enhance its effect. Thus we find *Bhayānaka* (in the meeting of the Brāhmaṇas with Ghaṭotkaca) ; *Karuṇa* (when each member offers his life for the sake of the whole family) ; *Raudra* and *Adbhuta* (Bhīma's encounter with Ghaṭotkaca, the magic noose, etc.), *Vatsala* (the scene between Bhīma and Ghaṭotkaca), and *Mugdha-śṛṅgāra* (the meeting of Bhīma and Hiḍimbā) are used in succession. The fight between the father and the son would create an atmosphere of

1 *Types of Sanskrit Drama*, pp. 59-61.

Hāsya and *Vīrābhāsa* on the minds of Bhīma and the spectators as they know the true relationship between the combatants; for Ghaṭotkaca, however, the whole scene produces *Vīra*. A number of similes and metaphors are employed while describing the Brahmaṇa family, the demon Ghaṭotkaca, etc. *Rūpaka* and *Atiśayokti* are found in v. 23 :

यस्त्रिशृंगो मम त्वासीन्मनोज्ञो वंशपर्वतः।
स मध्यशृंगभंगेन मनस्तपति मे भृशम्॥

Critical remarks. The poet has handled his material very skilfully so that the play contains many moments of great stage effect. The scene between Bhīma and Ghaṭotkaca reminds one of the similar situation between Arjuna and Abhimanyu in the *Pañc.* The play lays down many rules of conduct according to Bhāsa. That the mother's order is to be implicitly obeyed irrespective of the consequences is illustrated by Ghaṭotkaca, who feels no compunction in harassing the Brāhmaṇas though sacred. It is also suggested that in a conflict between the orders of one's parents, the order proceeding from one's mother outweighs that of the father. The ideal of self-sacrifice is beautifully expressed in the speeches of the Brāhmaṇa and his sons. The play is bound to impress on the spectators the importance of Mātṛbhakti, Brāhmaṇabhakti and of the principles of self-sacrifice and self-effacement. We also find in this play the recourse to magic to bind and unbind Bhīma. Is it significant that the last verse in praise of Upendra is composed in the *Upendra-Vajrā* metre ?

With regard to the five one-act plays considered so far, we may say in general that they were written by the poet with a view to place certain ideals in life before all the public in general and the princes of his royal patron in particular. There is always an undercurrent of Viṣṇu worship and Brāhmaṇa superiority in all the plays. The *Dv.* shows the futility of "the dispossessed's desire to recover his heritage by flattery and froth" ; and its motif is stated as "Efforts win where Prayers fail."[1] The *Karṇa* idealizes magnanimity, incidentally laying stress on the fact that the general satisfaction of the populace is the key-note of the life of a successful sovereign. The

1 Dharmasila Jayaswal, *MR*, December 1925, p. 665.

Dgh more or less emphasizes the righteous warfare and the observance of the ethics of the battle-field, and the proper respect to be paid to the elders. The *Ūru* is principally a drama depicting the self-respect of a dignified sovereign incidentally referring to the covetability of death on the battle-field and the devotion to one's parents.

PAÑCARĀTRA.

Title. The play gets its name from 'Five Nights' within which Droṇa is to bring news of the Pāṇḍavas to entitle them to their share of the kingdom according to Duryodhana's stipulation (pp. 43-44).

Plot. After the benedictory stanza in which the names of the principal characters in the drama are introduced, the stage-manager hears the praise of the grand sacrifice performed by Duryodhana; three Brāhmaṇas between themselves give a detailed description of the sacrifice, the sacrificial fire, the Brāhmaṇas engaged therein, etc. at great length. Towards the close of their conversation which ends the interlude, the Brāhmaṇas announce the entry of Bhīṣma and Droṇa followed by Śakuni, Karṇa and Duryodhana. All those assembled congratulate Duryodhana on the successful termination of the sacrifice which was the *sine qua non* of the Kṣatriya emperors. Duryodhana then pays his respects to Droṇa, Bhīṣma, and Śakuni, and they confer their blessings on him. He embraces his friend Karṇa. Then Droṇa introduces the kings that had come to attend the function and in accordance with their respective ages Duryodhana either salutes them or pronounces his blessings for them. Droṇa presents Abhimanyu to Duryodhana but simultaneously Śakuni presents Sahadeva, son of Jarāsandha, and hence Abhimanyu is placed in the back-ground and Sahadeva receives blessings from Duryodhana. Duryodhana notices the absence of Virāṭa in the great circle of kings assembled, and Śakuni states that the king was invited and perhaps might be on his way. Then Duryodhana offers to give *dakṣiṇā* to Droṇa; the latter, after much hesitation, begins to state his *dakṣiṇā*, but his eyes are full of tears at which Bhīṣma says that all the efforts of Duryodhana were fruitless as his preceptor was in grief. Duryodhana gives a solemn undertaking to offer anything that Droṇa might be

pleased to choose, and Droṇa asks for a share in the kingdom for the Pāṇḍavas. Śakuni objects to any such gift and says that it was a deceit practised by Droṇa on his *śiṣya*—at which Droṇa rightly feels indignant and an altercation follows in which Bhīṣma and Duryodhana also take part. When matters seem to take a serious turn, Bhīṣma tries to pacify both Duryodhana and Droṇa. The preceptor then tells Duryodhana that it was mainly to bury all the differences and disputes in the Kuru family that he had asked for a share in the kingdom for the Pāṇḍavas. Duryodhana wishes to consult Śakuni, who finds that Duryodhana does not wish to back out of the agreement but is willing to get out of it by quibbling. So Śakuni finds a way out. He suggests that should Droṇa bring the news of the Pāṇḍavas within 'five nights', Duryodhana would be ready to part with half his kingdom. Droṇa finds the condition to be impossible of being fulfilled. Bhīṣma, however, desires that Duryodhana should take a solemn vow, and accordingly Duryodhana declares his vow. News is brought from Virāṭa explaining his inability to attend the sacrificial function owing to the slaughter of one hundred Kīcakas by an unknown, and unarmed person. Bhīṣma at once sees in that the handiwork of Bhīma and knows thereby that the Pāṇḍavas, were residing in Virāṭa Nagara. At the suggestion of Bhīṣma, Droṇa accepts the condition of five days. Bhīṣma then professes his private feud with Virāṭa and proposes a cattle-raid. All agree to that and make a march against the Virāṭa capital. (Act I).

The next act opens with an interlude by which we get a glimpse of the life of cowherds and learn that the Kaurava forces have reached the outskirts of Virāṭa Nagara and have begun the cattle-raid. Virāṭa, when informed of the incident, orders his chariot to be made ready for the fight, and calls Bhagavān (Yudhiṣṭhira in disguise) for consultation. Virāṭa further learns that practically all the Kauravas with Droṇa, Kṛpa and Abhimanyu were leading the army for the cattle-raid. Later on he is told by his *Sūta* that His Royal Highness Prince Uttara had already proceeded to the battle front. Bhagavān at once advises recalling of the young prince as he was unable to withstand the great attack. Virāṭa thereupon sends for another chariot and is worried on hearing

that Bṛhannalā had gone as Prince Uttara's charioteer. But Bhagavān assures him of the skill of Bṛhannalā. Then news is gradually brought of the surrounding of Uttara's chariot by the enemies and, later, of the ceaseless shower of arrows from the chariot, which only Abhimanyu was able to retaliate. Hearing of Abhimanyu's valour, Bhagavān advises the despatch of another charioteer; but finally the news of the utter rout of the Kauravas is brought in. Immediately on the conclusion of the war Prince Uttara is engaged in entering the names of the heroes in the annals of the state; so Bṛhannalā is called to inform the assembly of the particulars of the war at length. Just as Bṛhannalā is about to begin her story, a messenger comes with the news that Abhimanyu had been captured by hand from his own chariot by the unarmed cook serving in the royal kitchen. Virāṭa orders Abhimanyu to be properly honoured and Bṛhannalā is asked to bring him in. Abhimanyu is being carried by Bhīma, and Bṛhannalā meets them both. Abhimanyu does not recognize his father and uncle, and the scene between the three is very humorous, having no parallel in the Sanskrit literature. Abhimanyu is presented before Virāṭa and the latter feels pleased with Abhimanyu's proud, wrathful, and truly royal behaviour. Then enters Uttara and he reveals the identity of the Pāṇḍavas, at which Abhimanyu pays proper respect to his elders and Virāṭa, and is suitably blessed in turn. Virāṭa feels much concerned as to the stay of Bṛhannalā (Arjuna in disguise) in his harem and offers the hand of Uttarā in marriage to Arjuna, as if in return for his services in checking the Kaurava onslaught. Arjuna realizes the anxiety of Virāṭa and accepts Uttarā as the bride for his son Abhimanyu, stating that he regarded the whole harem with maternal respect. Virāṭa is pleased and he agrees to the marriage, which it is decided to celebrate that very day. Uttara is asked to approach the grandfather, Bhīṣma, with an invitation to all the Kauravas to attend the nuptials. (Act II).

The next scene opens in the Kaurava camp. All learn of the capture of Abhimanyu and make ready to fight for his release. Duryodhana also feels much concerned, offers to go himself to free Abhimanyu, and like a true hero that he was, exclaims (III. 4):

मम हि पितृभिरस्य प्रस्तुतो ज्ञातिभेद-
स्तदिह मयि तु दोषो वक्तृभिः पातनीयः।
अथ च मम स पुत्रः पाण्डवानां तु पश्चात्
सति च कुलविरोधे नापराध्यन्ति बालाः॥

Karṇa praises this aspect of Duryodhana's character, but Śakuni, as usual, passes caustic remarks. Bhīṣma and Droṇa from the details of the capture told by Abhimanyu's charioteer infer that it must be Bhīma that was responsible for taking Abhimanyu a prisoner of war. Śakuni, however, doubts all this and tauntingly says that Uttarā also must in reality have been Arjuna. Bhīṣma replies by stating that the mere sound of the twang of the bow was sufficient to convince that the master-archer was none else than Arjuna. Further proof of the identity of Arjuna is just then brought in by Bhīṣma's charioteer who brings an arrow which struck the banner of Bhīṣma's chariot. Bhīṣma gives the arrow with the name of the owner inscribed to Śakuni to read the name, and Śakuni throws it away after reading the name 'Arjuna'. The arrow falls at the feet of Droṇa who takes it as the homage paid by his disciple. Śakuni begins by saying that the hero might be another Arjuna; but the entry of Uttarā who comes as a messenger from Yudhiṣṭhira sets all the doubts at rest. Yudhiṣṭhira in his message tells the assembly of the proposed wedding of Uttarā with Abhimanyu and invites them all to the wedding, asking whether the ceremony should be celebrated at Virāṭa Nagara or at their place. Śakuni replies that the celebration should take place at Virāṭa Nagara. Droṇa then approaches Duryodhana and claims the fulfilment of his part of the promise as he had satisfied the condition precedent. Duryodhana agrees to part with half the kingdom for the sake of the Pāṇḍavas. This makes Droṇa and all others quite happy. The normal epilogue from Droṇa's mouth brings the play to an end. (Act III).

Deviations: The cattle-raid is found in the *Mbh*, but the poet has made it motivated, as helping Droṇa to get news of the Pāṇḍavas within the stipulated period. Everything else that we find in the play has been invented by the poet. Dr. Woolner states that the slaughter of the Kīcakas is not mentioned,[1] but we have references to it

1 *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Volume I, p. 107.

on pp. 41-42 and I. 51 of the *Pañc*. Only three Pāṇḍavas are mentioned in the play. The sacrifice performed by Duryodhana, his agreement with Droṇa, Abhimanyu's siding with the Kauravas, the pastoral life of the cowherds, the scene between Bhīma, Abhimanyu and Bṛhannalā, Duryodhana's division of the kingdom with the Pāṇḍavas—all these are invented by the poet, and they help to bring out the good factors in Duryodhana's character. Dr. Winternitz objects to these liberties on the ground that they do not improve the story;[1] but the object of the poet, as stated above, is to emphasize the nobility of Duryodhana's character.

Type of drama: Drs. Ganapati Sastri and Keith take the *Pañc* to be a *Samavakāra*[2] which the *Daśarūpa* defines as under (III. 62-67):

कार्यं समवकारेऽपि त्रामुखं नाटकादिवत् ॥
ख्यातं देवासुरं वस्तु निर्विमर्शास्तु सन्धयः ।
वृत्तयो मन्दकैशिक्यो नेतारो देवदानवाः ॥
द्वादशोदात्तविख्याताः फलं तेषां पृथक्पृथक् ।
बहुवीररसाः सर्वे बहुदम्भोद्भिमन्थने ॥
अङ्कैर्न्निर्भिन्निकपटस्निग्धहारस्त्रिविद्रवः ।
द्विसन्धिरङ्कः प्रथमः कार्यो द्वादशनालिकः ॥
चतुर्दिनालिकावन्त्यौ नालिका घटिकाद्वयम् ।
वस्तुस्वभावदैवादिकृताः स्युः कपटाङ्कयः ॥
नगरोपरोधयुद्धे वातास्यादिकविद्रवाः ।
धर्मार्थकामैः शृङ्गारो नात्र विन्दुप्रवेशकौ ॥
वीथ्यङ्गानि यथालाभं कुर्यात् प्रहसने यथा ।

The *Pañc* does not answer the particulars with regard to the story not concerning gods and demons, and the absence of *Śṛṅgāra*. With regard to the absence of *Śṛṅgāra*, it may be mentioned that *Śṛṅgāra* is not mentioned as a necessity in a *Samavakāra* in the *Pratāparudriya*. So the divergence is in regard to the plot, which however, can be explained away by taking Duryodhana, Bhīṣma and others as देवकल्पाः as is done by Dr. G. Sastri.[3] Prof. Mankad seems to prefer the *Pañc* being classed as a *Vyāyoga* but as stated by him contrary to *Vyāyogas* it has three acts and difficult verses.[4] We think, the minor divergence from the definition of

1 *BRRI*, 5. p. 9. 2 *Pañc*. pp. 116-117; *SD*, pp. 96-97. 3 *Pañc*. p. 117.
4 *Types of Sanskrit Drama*. p. 56.

a *Samavakāra* may be due to the difference between the standard text on dramaturgy in Bhāsa's time and those composed later on; and hence it is better to take the *Pañc* as a *Samavakāra.*

Sentiments etc. The main sentiment underlying the whole play is *Vira* in its various aspects, such as *Dharmavira* in Duryodhana, *Dayāvira* in Droṇa and *Yuddhavira* in all the characters. The scene in which Abhimanyu figures along with Bhīma and Bṛhannalā is a good instance of *Hāsya* and *Vatsala* with *Vira* in the background. Many classical metres are used in this play and there is a comparatively large number of different figures of speech. At the beginning of the play, the different particulars of the various aspects of the sacrifice are brought out in beautiful similes and metaphors. *Aprastutaprašaṁsā* is found in I. 23, 41, 53; *Arthāntaranyāsa* in II. 33; *Virodhābhāsa* in II. 32 etc. The style on the whole is *sātvati* (grand) and *ārabhaṭi* (violent).

Critical remarks. The play has no real female character; Bṛhannalā is merely Arjuna in disguise. The elaborately worked out similes while describing the sacrifice and the lengthy and tiresome description with the minute details seem quite out of place at the present day. But at the time when these plays were written *i. e.* in the pre-Mauryan epoch, when the newly started Buddhism was making headway against the orthodox Hinduism, the deliberate inclusion of the details of the sacrificial paraphernalia in the drama, would certainly not have failed to be appreciated by the spectators of those days especially when sacrifices were actually performed. The drama was probably written to be staged at the occasion of some sacrifice and hence it naturally glorifies the institution. A list of well-known kings is appended, who though dead in body are said to live only through the sacrifices performed by them (I. 25):

इक्ष्वाकुगय्यातिययातिराम-
मान्धातृनाभागनृगाम्बरीषाः ।
एते सकोशाः पुरुषाः सराष्ट्रा
नष्टाः शरीरैः क्रतुभिर्चरन्ते ॥

We learn from this play much about the sociological

conditions of the period, about the pastoral life, the relations between the two premier castes, the preparations for war, etc., which will be dealt with at their proper places later on. Heavy responsibilities of a teacher are thus brought out by Droṇa (I. 21) :

अतीत्य बन्धूनवलङ्घ्य मित्रा-
प्याचार्यमागच्छति शिष्यदोषः ।
बालं ह्यपत्यं गुरवे प्रदातु—
नैवापराधोऽस्ति पितुर्न मातुः ॥

The ideal that the king should place before him is stated in I. 24 ; I. 30 :

विप्रोत्सङ्गे विसमावर्त्य सर्वं
राज्ञा देयं चापमात्रं सुतेभ्यः ॥१.२४॥
किं तद् द्रव्यं किं फलं को विशेषः
क्षत्राचार्यो यत्र विप्रो दरिद्रः ॥१.३०॥

Similarly the ideal that a man should attain is hinted by Bhīṣma (p. 106 रूपेण स्त्रियः कथ्यन्ते । पराक्रमेण तु पुरुषाः ।). The evil deeds of his kinsmen naturally pain a thoughtful person and make him feel guilty (II. 9) :

एकोदकत्वं खलु नाम लोके
मनस्विनां कम्पयते मनांसि ।
वैरप्रियैस्तैर्हि कृतेऽपराधे
वत्सत्वमस्माभिरिवापराद्धम् ॥

According to Dr. Winternitz "it is funny, when.... [Uttara] in the midst of battle occupies himself with writing down the deeds of warriors in a book...." and he takes this as indicating a later writer for the *Pañc.*[1] It should be noted in this connection that it is not ***in the midst of battle*** but ***after the conclusion of the battle*** that Uttara is engaged in entering the valorous deeds of the warriors. अवजितं गोग्रहणम् । अपवाता धार्तराष्ट्राः ।'''दृष्टपरिस्पन्दानां योधपुरुषाणां कर्माणि पुस्तकमारोपयति कुमारः । also, II. 28, and p. 91—पूजिताः कृतकर्माणो योधपुरुषाः ।. Further, this seems to be an ancient practice indirectly referred to in the *Arthaśāstra*;[2] so our poet knew the tradition and rightly incorporated it. It is only because the ancient tradition is not properly appreciated and the antiquity to which our poet is entitled on account of his

1 *BBRI*, 5, p. 9. 2 *Kaut. Arth.*, X. 131, p. 368.

correct mention of old practices is denied to him, that these particulars (as well as the boring description of sacrifices etc. referred to above) appear 'funny.' They were certainly seen in their proper perspective by the readers and the spectators of those days. In Dr. Woolner's opinion, the story of the drama is far inferior to the epic.[1] But in view of the poet's specific aims of glorifying Duryodhana and the institution of sacrifice, he has changed the epic-story, and the public of his day also must have appreciated the change, especially on account of the onslaught of the Buddhists on the sacrifices, *himsā*, etc., which was the feature of the day. The transverse curtain seems to have been used in the staging of this play when Bṛhannalā, Bhīma and Abhimanyu approach the Virāṭa Sabhā (pp. 80-90). The first three lines of the last verse in the first act (I. 57) are completed by four different speakers, while the last line serves as a chorus for all.

द्रोणः—तस्मान्मे रथमानयन्तु पुरुषाः
शकुनिः— हस्ती ममानीयताम्।
कर्णः—भारार्थं मृगमुद्यतैरिह हयैर्युक्तो रथः स्थाप्यताम्॥
भीष्मः—वृद्धिर्मे त्वरते विराटनगरं गन्तुं धनुस्वर्यताम्।
सर्वे—मुक्त्वा चापमिहैव तिष्ठतु भवानाज्ञाविधेया वयम्॥

Dr. Woolner states that the last verse suggests the *Pañc* being written on the ending of a feud in some royal family.[2] It may be that the play was written to celebrate the sacrifice and this may have incidentally ended some feud.

ABHIṢEKA.

Title. '*Abhiṣeka*' means 'coronation' and as such the title is more than significant for this play, as it refers to three coronations in all (Act I. p. 16. सुग्रीवस्याभिषेकः कल्प्यताम्। Act IV. p. 51—विभीषण! अद्यप्रभृति मद्वचनाद्राक्षसेश्वरो भव। and p. 82, VII. 15; VI. 34 according to Triv. Edn.—प्राज्ञाभिषेकः कृतः।).

Plot. After reciting the benedictory stanza in praise of Rāma, the stage-manager hears the words addressed by Lakṣmaṇa to Sugrīva and informs the audience of the compact between Rāma and Sugrīva for mutual help. The main scene opens in Kiṣkindhā where Hanuman and

1 *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Volume I, pp. 106-107. 2 *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Volume I, p. 107.

Sugrīva, after being convinced of the skill and might of Rāma in archery, lead both Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa. Sugrīva then roars loudly and challenges his elder brother Vālin for fight. Disregarding the prayers of Tārā not to indulge in fight, or at least to go after consulting the ministers, Vālin orders her to go inside and rushes to the spot where Sugrīva was awaiting him. Then begins a great duel between the brothers. Sugrīva's fall fills Hanuman with consternation and he reminds Rāma of his vow. Rāma reassures him and by his arrow very nearly kills Vālin, who drops down unconscious, bleeding. After recovery, Vālin learns from the name on the arrow that it was Rāma who had struck him and he charges the latter with unrighteousness in striking from behind an ambush. Rāma justifies himself on the ground that Vālin was a mere animal and further he deserved punishment, there being a subtle distinction between the wrongs committed by Vālin and Sugrīva. Though not evidently satisfied, Vālin does not advance any further argument, and consoles himself by saying that he was freed of his sin by meeting his death at the hands of Rāma. Sugrīva feels grieved at Vālin's death but the latter pacifies him and asks him to keep away the wailing women. Then Aṅgada enters and overwhelmed with grief falls to the ground. Vālin, however, consoles him and places him under the care of Sugrīva; he also gives Sugrīva his golden wreath, the family treasure. Then after sipping the water brought by Hanuman, Vālin has visions of the sacred rivers, the apsarasas, the thousand-swanned chariot, etc., and finally dies. Rāma then orders Sugrīva to offer funeral obsequies to Vālin and orders Lakṣmaṇa to get ready for Sugrīva's coronation. (Act I).

The interlude tells of the different batches of Vānaras being sent in all directions in search of Sītā, and of Hanuman's flight to Laṅkā after learning the whereabouts of Sītā from the great bird-king. The next scene opens in a garden in Laṅkā with Sītā surrounded by Rakṣasīs. Sītā is meditating on Rāma when Hanuman enters with the ring in his hand after having searched for Sītā at all possible places in Laṅkā. Seeing the dazzling being in the midst of the hideous Rākṣasīs, Hanuman is puzzled as to who she should be. At the approach of

Rāvaṇa with his suite, Hanuman hides himself behind the branches of a tree. Rāvaṇa proudly addresses Sītā using contemptuous language towards Rāma and tries by various means to win her, but she is adamant in her devotion to Rāma. Hanuman knows of the identity of Sītā from these conversations, and Rāvaṇa's insolence makes him angry; but he controls his anger. Rāvaṇa finally approaches Sītā with his vile request, she curses him and he becomes confused. At that precise moment the beating of the drums informs him that it was time for his bath, and so Rāvaṇa makes his exit with his suite. Hanuman gets down from the trunk of the tree after Rāvaṇa is gone and informs Sītā that he has been sent by Rāma to learn news of her. Sītā does not believe him at first, taking him to be some Rākṣasa in disguise, but the mention of Rāma's name inspires confidence in her. Hanuman's description of the sorrowful and lovelorn condition of Rāma, makes Sīta's heart swing between happiness and misery. From her further questions she learns of Vāli's death and of Rāma's proposed invasion of Laṅkā. Hanuman gives her a message of hope. Sītā finally asks him to inform Rāma of her condition in such a manner that he may not be grieved. Then Hanuman decides to ravage the gardens to inform Rāvaṇa of his arrival. (Act II).

Śaṅkukarṇa, Rāvaṇa's servant, informs Rāvaṇa of the complete destruction of the Aśoka garden by a monkey. Rāvaṇa orders the capture of the monkey and Śaṅkukarṇa informs him step by step of the havoc wrought by Hanuman. On knowing that all the trees and bowers were crushed, the Dāruparvata broken and the keepers made unconscious, Rāvaṇa orders an army a thousand strong to capture the monkey; but news is again brought that Hanuman has killed all of them with trees. Then Rāvaṇa orders his son Akṣa to capture the monkey, but news is again received that not only Akṣa but five more commanders that followed him have been killed by the monkey with his fist and the golden gate-way respectively. Then Rāvaṇa prepares to meet the monkey himself, but is told that Indrajit has rushed against the enemy. Finally the gladdening news comes that Indrajit has captured the monkey, and bound him with a rope. Then Rāvaṇa calls Bibhīṣaṇa and also asks the monkey to

be brought before him. Bibhīṣaṇa offers some advice to Rāvaṇa but the latter orders him to stop. Rāvaṇa contemptuously asks Hanuman his name and the reason why he entered the private quarters. After telling his parentage and name, Hanuman begins to deliver the commands of Rāma; but Rāvaṇa feels indignant and orders the monkey to be killed. On being told that messengers were never to be killed, Rāvaṇa prepares to hear the message which is that under any circumstance Rāma is going to kill him. Rāvaṇa laughs at this and boasts of his strength; but Hanuman asks him why it was then that Sītā was stealthily carried away. Bibhīṣaṇa also repeats the question and advises Rāvaṇa to return Sītā. Rāvaṇa, however, abuses him and speaks slightingly of Rāma. When Hanuman pays him back in the same coin, he orders Hanuman to be sent away after setting fire to his tail. Rāvaṇa asks Hanuman to tell Rāma to offer him (*i. e.*, Rāvaṇa) a great battle, at which Hanuman retorts that Rama will destroy the whole city and kill Rāvaṇa. After Hanuman is gone Bibhīṣaṇa again offers his advice to return Sītā and thus avoid a fierce conflict with a strong enemy. Rāvaṇa accuses his brother of espousing the cause of the enemy and orders his removal. Bibhīṣaṇa tells Rāvaṇa to suppress his anger and passion, and sets out to go to Rāma and try to save the race of the Rākṣasas. (Act III).

The interlude informs us that immediately on knowing the whereabouts of Sītā, Sugrīva makes preparations to start for Laṅkā with the Vānara army. Then enter Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa, Sugrīva and Hanuman, who have reached the shores of the ocean along with the Vānara army. Almost immediately, Bibhīṣaṇa comes on the scene, much in doubt as to the sort of treatment that would be accorded to him by Rāma. Hanuman introduces Bibhīṣaṇa to Rāma and after mutual salutations and greetings Rāma accepts him as the king of Laṅkā. Bibhīṣaṇa advises Rāma to hurl a divine missile at the ocean when his counsel was sought as to how to cross the ocean. The God of ocean, the divine Varuṇa, however, appears in human form, praises Rāma and affords a passage for crossing the ocean by being divided into two. Rāma with his army crosses the ocean and encamps at Suvela, near Laṅkā. Nīla, the

commander-in-chief of the Vānara forces comes across two strangers disguised as the servants of Kumudaka in the army whom he places before Rāma. Bibhīṣaṇa recognizes them as Śuka and Sāraṇa, the favourite ministers of Rāvaṇa and suggests condign punishment for the spies. But Rāma orders their release and tells them to inform Rāvaṇa of his arrival in Laṅkā for battle. After their exit, Rāma with Bibhīṣaṇa and others starts to review the army. (Act IV).

The interlude informs us of the serious reverses of the Rākṣasa forces, of the deaths of Prahasta, Kumbhakarṇa, and other leaders in the battle, and of Indrajit's entry on the battle-field. Despite all this, Rāvaṇa is reported to be passionate and unmindful of good counsel. Two replicas of the heads of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa have been prepared as ordered by Rāvaṇa. The main scene opens in the Aśoka Vanikā, where Sītā who is surrounded as usual by the Rākṣasīs sees bad omens. Rāvaṇa on his way finds that lady Laṅkā is leaving him. Still he approaches Sītā with a view to tempt her by suave words and threats. Rāvaṇa is followed by his servant carrying the replicas of the heads, who informs his master of Indrajit's killing Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa in the battle. This makes Sītā fall down and faint, but she recovers soon and requests Rāvaṇa to kill her with the self-same sword. Rāvaṇa asks her: "By whom now wilt thou be released?" The Rākṣasa messenger who enters at that moment informs that Indrajit has been killed and the news shocks Rāvaṇa, who falls swooning after reviving twice, but recovers again and is enraged at the reported flight of his forces. On hearing that Rāma is rushing at Laṅka, Rāvaṇa rises quickly with his sword to fight with Rāma, but his own servant prevents him. Rāvaṇa then sets out to kill Sītā as the sole cause of his misery, but is again prevented by the servant. Finally Rāvaṇa enters his chariot brought there and starts for the battle-field. Sītā offers her prayers to the gods for the victory of her Lord. (Act V).

The interlude (which forms Act VI of the Lahore Edition, as also of the Trippunithura Sanskrit College manuscript utilized by Prof. Pisharoti)[1] describes in

1 p. 74 n6, Lahore edition; *AUJ*, 5, p. 245 n1.

detail the terrible fight between Rāma and Rāvaṇa, which three Vidyādharas observe from a distance. Each in his turn gives some particulars of the fight, which ends in the death of Rāvaṇa, in the shower of flowers from the heavens and in the blowing of the divine trumpets. The main scene (Act VII of the Lahore Edition and the Trippunithura manuscript) introduces Rāma as entering Laṅkā to console Sītā. Lakṣmaṇa and Bibhīṣaṇa inform Rāma of the approaching Sītā, but the latter expresses his desire to keep her outside as she had become a stain on the Ikṣvāku race by her long stay with the Rākṣasas. Hearing of Rāma's opinion, Sītā asks for permission to enter fire, which Rāma sanctions. Then Lakṣmaṇa enters with the news of Sītā's coming out triumphantly from the fire-ordeal and of the approach of the divine Agni in human form leading Sītā. Agni guarantees the purity of Sītā, who is but Goddess Lakṣmī in human form. Divine Gandharvas and Vidyādharas etc. sing behind the curtain, and Rāma and Sītā go in for their coronation, Agni showing them the way while Bibhīṣaṇa and Lakṣmaṇa sing the praise of Rāma. Finally the crowned Rāma enters with Sītā and informs all of his coronation through God's will at the hands of his father though long dead. Agni tells Rāma of the approach of Bharata and Śatrughna and the subjects of Rāma as well as Mahendra and other gods to greet Rāma. The usual epilogue brings the play to its close.

Deviations. The poet has very closely followed the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The manner of crossing the ocean through divided waters, as in crossing the river in the *Bāl*, is the peculiar invention of our poet. The setting of fire to Laṅkā by Hanuman is not referred to in the drama. Prof. Ghatak states that the conversation between Lakṣmī and Rāmacandra even before Rāvaṇa's abduction of Sītā is a departure from the *Rāmāyaṇa*;[1] but we have not been able to find the particular reference in the *Abh.*

Type of drama. This play belongs to the variety *Nāṭaka* which is thus defined in the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* (VI. 7-11):

नाटकं ख्यातवृत्तं स्यात्पञ्चसन्धिसमन्वितम् ।
विलासर्द्ध्यादिगुणवद् दृश्यं नानाविभूतिभिः ॥

1. *JDL*, 12, p. 40.

सुखदुःखसमुद्भूति नानारसनिरन्तरम् ।
पञ्चाधिका दशपरास्तत्राङ्काः परिकीर्तिताः ॥
प्रख्यातवंशो राजर्षिर्धीरोदात्तः प्रतापवान् ।
दिव्योऽथ दिव्यादिव्यो वा गुणवानस्यावको मतः ॥
एक एव भवेदङ्गी शृङ्गारो वीर एव वा ।
अङ्गमन्ये रसाः सर्वे कार्यो निर्वहणेऽद्भुतः ॥
चत्वारः पञ्च वा मुख्याः कार्यव्यापृतपूरुषाः ।
गोपुच्छाग्रसमाङ्गं तु बन्धनं तस्य कीर्तितम् ॥

It will be found that the *Abh* conforms in general to the requirements of a *Nāṭaka* as stated in various works on dramaturgy. The plot is *prakhyāta*, the hero is *dhīrodātta*, and the main sentiment is *Vīra*. To the main story of the coronation of Rāma is added the secondary incident *(patākā)* of Sugrīva-kathā. There are also a number of *praveśakas*.

Sentiments etc. The main sentiment is *Vīra* (heroic),—mainly *Yuddha-Vīra*. The wailings of Sugrīva, Aṅgada, etc., and Sītā's miserable condition supply us with *Karuṇa* (pathetic); the appearance of Varuṇa and Agni, as also the description of the fire-ordeal belong to *Adbhuta* (wonderful); the scenes between Rāvaṇa and Sītā provide *Bhayānaka* (fearful). The *Pūrṇopamā* in VI. 2, *Svabhāvokti* (II. 21), *Aprastutaprašaṁsā* (III. 19), *Ullekha* (I. 25), *Utprekṣā* (I. 22), *Upamā and Rūpaka* (IV. 3), and *Upamā* (IV. 18) are some of the instances of various figures of speech used in this play.

अनशनपरितप्तं पाण्डु सद्यामवक्त्रं
तव वरगुणचिन्तावीतलावण्यलीलम् ।
वहति विगतधैर्यं हीयमानं शरीरं
मनसिजशरदग्धं बाष्पपर्याकुलाक्षम् ॥२.२१॥

कथं लम्बस्टः सिंहो मृगेषु विनिपात्यते ।
गजो वा सुमहान् मत्तः शृगालेन निहन्यते
॥३.१६॥

रजनिचरशरीरनीरकीर्णा
कपिवरवीचियुता वरासिनक्रा ।
उदधिरिव विभाति युद्धभूमी
रघुवरचन्द्रशरांशुवृद्धवेगा ॥६.२॥
अतिबलसुखशायी पूर्वमासीद्धरीन्द्रः ?
क्षितितलपरिवर्ती क्षीणसर्वाङ्गचेष्टः ।
शरवरपरिवीतं त्यक्तमुत्सृज्य देहं
किमभिलषसि वीर स्वर्गमद्याभिगन्तुम्
॥१.२५॥

The following figures about the ocean are particularly notable, as the *Abh* is probably the only play in our group in which *Alaṁkāras* concerning the ocean occur:

सजलजलधरेन्द्रनीलनीरो
विलुलितफेनतरङ्गचारुहारः ।
समधिगतनदीसहस्रबाहु-
र्हरिरिव भाति सरित्पतिः शयानः ॥४.३॥
मम शरवरवातपातभग्ना
कपिवरसैन्यतरङ्गताडितान्ता ।
उदधिजलगतेव नौर्विपन्ना
निपतति रावणकर्णधारदोषात् ॥४.१८॥

Critical remarks. The first act in which Vālin meets with his death at the hands of Rāma and "dies on the stage is a little tragedy by itself" according to Dr. Winternitz.[1] But this is not so, as Vālin is not the hero. That the *Abh* is the earlier work between the two "Rāma plays" is suggested by Dr. Sarup and Mr. V. Ramayya, and our tests for the chronological order of these plays also confirm the view.[2] Possibly the play was written in haste to be complete in time for the celebration of some coronation, and hence the poet has effected no innovations over the epic in the plot, and there is nothing in this play "comparable to the scene in the statue gallery nor is there the same delicacy in portraying the characters of Rāma and Sītā".[3] Yet it is not so dreary a summary of the epic as Dr. Keith would have us believe, nor is Rāma 'the ruthless warrior' as suggested by Dr. Woolner.[4] The peculiar trait of Bhāsa of investing each character with special and distinguishing voices so that persons may differentiate between the speakers without actually seeing them on account of their voices is found in this play in common with the other plays of the group. Some families are represented as possessing similar voice peculiarities. Similarly the characters of Bhāsa know what passes in others' minds from a mere glance at their faces. Other common features are the description of the fight by three Vidyādharas, the appearance of Agni and Varuṇa on the stage in human form, etc. The song in this play forms an important element as it is found in Gandharvas, Apsarasas, Vidyādharas etc., singing the praise of Viṣṇu.

---

1 *Problems*, p. 112. 2 Sarup, *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Volume 2, p. 144 nl; V. Ramayya, *QJMS*, 17, p. 180; Supra p. 121. 3 Woolner and Sarup, *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Volume 2, p. 144. 4 Keith, *SD*, p. 105; Woolner, *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Volume 2, p. 144.

Plainly speaking, Rāma's justification for killing Vālin is neither satisfactory nor convincing. As the fight of Rāvaṇa is only described and its actual representation is avoided, Prof. Pisharoti thinks that this drama may be from a different hand from the writer of the *Ūru*, the *Prat*, or the *Bāl*.[1] It may be pointed out that in the *Ūru* also there is a mere description of the fight, and the *Abh* contains death in the first act. It is not necessary for the poet to take up every opportunity of depicting death on the stage to justify his authorship of the plays in this group. Another confirmation for the view that our text has been badly mangled and that the verse quoted by Abhinavagupta may have formed a part of this play is found in the line (p. 13 दग्धिवतस्त्वं हि दग्ध्यत्वाददग्धयो नैव दग्ध्यते) which occurs as a prose passage. It is clear that the line is a part of a stanza, the other half seems to be lost. The text is not perfect and does not yield a satisfactory meaning; some additional passage is necessary to complete the sense. On this analogy also the exclusion or the disappearance of the verse quoted by Abhinavagupta appears quite plausible.[2] The contrast between the attitudes of Sugrīva (I. 8) and Vālin (I. 9) to each other is brought out in a single verse :

अपराधमनुद्दिश्य परित्यक्तस्त्वया विभो ! ।
युद्धे त्वत्पादशुश्रूषां सुग्रीवः कर्तुमिच्छति ।
॥१.८॥

सुग्रीवमथ समरे विनिपात्यमाने
तं पश्य शोणितपरिप्लुतसर्वगात्रम्
॥१.९॥

Bibhīṣaṇa's parting advice is quite suitable for every man of action (III. 25) :

त्यक्त्वा रोषं च कामं च यथा कार्यं तथा कुरु ।

Implicit obedience to the elder even in contravention of personal convictions and Dharma, which is the key-note of Lakṣmaṇa's character is beautifully brought out in VII. 4 :

विज्ञाय देव्याः शौचं च श्रुत्वाचार्यस्य शासनम् ।
धर्मस्नेहान्तरे न्यस्ता बुद्धिर्दोलायते मम ॥

---

1 *AUJ*, 5, pp. 245-246, n4. 2 See Supra pp. 45-47. The *Abh* (Act II, p. 27) contains the expression न शक्नोमि रोषं धारयितुम् in common with the *Dph* (p. 69) and the *Prat* (p. 30) ; and the expression भवतु । अहमेवार्यरामस्य कार्यं साधयामि (p. 27) immediately following the above, similar to the *Dv* (p. 24 अहमेव पाण्डवानां कार्यं साधयामि । signifying thereby common authorship and authorship of Bhāsa. Cf. also Sukthankar. *ABI*, 4, pp. 174, 184, 185, 186.

The description of Rāma being the cause of everything, still praying to Varuṇa for his purpose (स्वयं कारणभूतः सन् कार्यार्थी समुपागतः), is nicely put (IV. 14). Charming is this description of the sunset (IV. 23) :

अस्ताद्रिमस्तकगतः प्रतिसंहृतांशुः
सन्ध्यानुरञ्जितवपुः प्रतिभाति सूर्यः ।
रक्तोज्ज्वलांशुकवृते द्विरदस्य कुम्भे
जाम्बूनदेन रचितः पुलको यथैव ॥

There is a marked tendency in this play for the use of *Yamakas* and alliterations in the prose passages as well as in verses, which is natural in an earlier work of the poet, when more attention is paid to the outward form and every attempt is made for the sound-effect. Cf. p. 3 ...नयनाभिरामस्य रामस्य...महाग्रीवस्य सुग्रीवस्य...हेममालिनं वालिनं... । p. 65.... निरस्तप्रहस्तनिकुम्भकुम्भकर्णेन्द्र...विकलबलजल निधिजनित...ममर समराधि... । and I. 1. 7 ; II. 4. 6. 10 ; VI. 13. The transverse curtain seems to have been used in this play in Act I.

BĀLA-CARITA.

Title. The play gets its name from the subject matter it deals with, *viz.* the feats *(carita)* of the boy *(bāla)* Kṛṣṇa.

Plot. The stage-manager after reciting the benedictory stanza in praise of Nārāyaṇa begins to address the audience when Nārada, the wanderer of the sky, descends on the stage. He finds no pleasure in the ever quiet ærial regions ; he is fond of music and of sowing seeds of discord, which give him pleasure. That divine sage Nārada is on his way to pay respects to Nārāyaṇa who was just then born of Devakī to slay Kaṁsa. He finds Devakī walking slowly towards Vasudeva, carrying the newly born babe in her arms. Having thus seen the sprouting of the seed of discord in the form of the baby Kṛṣṇa, Nārada returns to his abode Brahmaloka, after circumambulating Lord Nārāyaṇa. Then begins the main scene of the first act with Devakī entering with a child in her hands. Kaṁsa had already killed her six sons and hence she is much anxious for the life of the new babe. Vasudeva finds the child in her arms as the death of Kaṁsa incarnate. Devakī entrusts the child to her husband to be carried away, so that it may be saved

from the clutches of Kaṁsa. It was midnight, all were asleep, and Vasudeva himself does not know where he is going to take the child when Devakī delivers it to him. Then he asks Devakī to go inside, and proceeds on his way with the child outside the gates of Mathurā. There is pitch darkness and Vasudeva is able to see his way through the light cast by the lustre of the child. Further on, he finds the river Jumna in flood and is perplexed for a minute, but decides to enter the flood, when lo! the waters stand parted yielding him a passage. Having crossed Jumna he reaches the cowherds' quarters and thinks of waiting at the foot of the Nyagrodha tree till dawn. His friend Nanda Gopa, however, is seen lamenting nearby with the dead body of his baby daughter in his hand. At the sound of his voice, Vasudeva calls out to his friend Nanda Gopa by name, but the latter feels afraid lest some Rākṣasa or ghost be calling him. Nanda Gopa later recognizes Vasudeva and formal greetings pass between the two. On Vasudeva's pressing Nanda Gopa to tell the truth, Nanda Gopa informs him of the death of his new-born daughter, and his coming away with the child without the knowledge of his wife Yašodā in order not to worry his tribesmen, in view of the Indrayajña festival the next day. After some persuasion and reminding of the previous obligations, Nanda Gopa agrees to keep Vasudeva's child with him. Through the greatness of the divine child there rises a column of water and Nanda Gopa has his purificatory bath therewith. Nanda Gopa then takes the child in his arms but finds it too heavy even for a very strong man like himself, and on Vasudeva's suggestion offers prayers to the child and it becomes of normal weight. The five divine weapons and Garuḍa appear on the stage, pay their homage to the Lord, and decide to be born in Gokula in the guise of herdsmen. Assuring Vasudeva that the child will be properly cared for, Nanda Gopa sets out to go back. Vasudeva also thinks of returning to Mathurā when he hears a cry which later proves to be that of the baby which was not really dead. So he takes up the baby, finds the Jumna fordable as before, and having crossed the river and the city-gates, enters the prison walls with the intention of telling everything to Devakī and consoling her. (Act I).

Kaṁsa meets with ill-omens such as the tumbling down of mansion-tops through earthquake etc. He also sees strange visions. Young *Cāṇḍāla* women appear before him and ask him to get married with them. Kaṁsa is afraid, but after a time the outcaste women disappear. Then comes on the stage Curse, named Vajrabāhu, emanated from Madhuka, in a terrible form, torch in hand, and he declares his intention of entering the heart of Kaṁsa. He disappears as suddenly as he had come and Kaṁsa tries to sleep but still gets illusions. Curse comes again with his associates, but Kaṁsa's Rājaśrī obstructs their entry. Curse tells her of Viṣṇu's order and she retires. Curse then embraces Kaṁsa and enters Kaṁsa's body and disappears. Kaṁsa suddenly wakes up and calls his portress. To his questions the portress replies that none had entered the palace. Kaṁsa calls Balākī, the chamberlain, and sends him to consult the astrologers with regard to the particular ill-omens, such as storms, earthquakes, shooting stars. Balākī returns with the information that the omens signify the birth of a divine being. It is further learnt that Devakī gave birth to a daughter. Kaṁsa sends for Vasudeva to get the correct news with regard to the sex of the child. Vasudeva tells Kaṁsa that a female child was born to Devakī. In spite of Devakī's protests Kaṁsa orders the child to be brought before him to be killed. Kaṁsa feels some regard for the child after seeing it, but ultimately catches hold of it and strikes it against the Kaṁsa-stone. The child bursts into two, one half falls to the ground and the other rises into the sky, transformed into Goddess Kārtyāyanī. Then enters Kārtyāyani with her weapons, all of whom declare their mission to kill Kaṁsa, and finally decide to be in the ghoṣa in the form of herdsmen, and make their exit. Kaṁsa then proposes to perform Śāntī on a grand scale in order to ward off the evil effects of bad omens, visions, etc. (Act II).

The interlude informs us of some of the feats of Kṛṣṇa since his stay in Gokula, which signalized an increase in the happiness of the herdsmen; freedom from disease in the cattle, and the appearance of fruits and flowers everywhere. The killing of Pūtanā by sucking her blood; killing Śakaṭa by a single kick; the killing of the demons Yamala and Arjuna standing in the form of trees by passing the

mortar to which he was tied by his mother between them and thus smashing the trees to pieces ; killing Dhenuka in the guise of an ass by throwing him by his hind legs at the palmyra tree ; and killing Keśī who came in the guise of a horse by riding over him : are the feats mentioned of the child who was named Dāmodara. Dāmodara and his elder brother, Saṅkarṣaṇa, prepare for Hallīsaka dance with the Gopa damsels. The main scene opens with the aged cowherd and a number of Gopa youths and maidens, after whom enter Dāmodara, Saṅkarṣaṇa and young Gopas. Music is sounded and all engage in Hallīsaka, the old man being content with witnessing the frolic. Some time after it, it is learnt that a demon named Ariṣṭarṣabha has entered the place. Saṅkarṣaṇa and the Gopa youths and maidens retire to the hillock nearby to witness the fight of Dāmodara with the demon in the form of the wicked bull. After a wordy war between them, Ariṣṭarṣabha is convinced of the divinity of the boy by his own inability to shake the child though standing on one foot. However, thinking that he would get heavens if killed by Viṣṇu, he offers to fight and Dāmodara throws him down. Ariṣṭarṣabha falls down dead covered all over with blood. Dāmaka enters and greets Dāmodara and informs him that Saṅkarṣaṇa has gone to the Jumna on hearing that Kāliya has come up there. Dāmodara replies by stating that he himself is going to suppress the pride of that lord of serpents. (Act III).

At the sight of Dāmodara ready to fight with Kāliya, the Gopa damsels are afraid and ask him not to enter the waters and request Saṅkarṣaṇa to prevent Dāmodara from entering the abode of Kāliya. Saṅkarṣaṇa consoles them saying that Kāliya is afraid and is bowing low to approaching Kṛṣṇa. Dāmodara enters the pool. The aged cowherd and Saṅkarṣaṇa watch the fight and find Kāliya subdued and Kṛṣṇa standing on the body. Then enters Dāmodara catching hold of Kāliya. Dāmodara plays the Hallīsaka dance on Kāliya's body and collects flowers from the trees. Kāliya offers some resistance but comes to know the divinity of the boy, when he finds the fiery poison emitted by him quite impotent to kill the boy. Kāliya then craves for the mercy of the Lord. Dāmodara orders him to leave the waters of the Jumna

saying that Garuḍa would no longer trouble him on account of the divine foot-prints on Kāliya's body. Kāilya withdraws his poison and retires from the pool with his retinue. Dāmodara offers the flowers to the Gopīs. A messenger from Kaṁsa comes with the news of the celebration of the Dhanurmaha festival at Mathurā and asks Dāmodara to attend the ceremony with his followers. In view of the divine mission (of killing K a ṁ s a) Dāmodara and Saṅkarṣaṇa agree to start for Mathurā. (Act IV).

Kaṁsa is awaiting the arrival of Dāmodara and Saṅkarṣaṇa and is determined to have them smashed by his wrestlers. Dhruvasena periodically goes out and brings him news of the feats of the two heroes after their entry into Mathurā. Dāmodara attacked the washermen and got clothes, and killed the great elephant Utpalāpīḍa sent against him. After entering the main s t r e e t s, Dāmodara took the scents and perfumes from the hands of the hunch-backed Madanikā, anointed his body with them and then made her body straight by massaging; he further got flowers from the florists and decorated himself with them ; then he proceeded towards the armoury, killed the keeper and broke the bow kept there, and was on his way to the audience hall. Hearing all this, Kaṁsa gets flurried and orders Cāṇūra and Muṣṭika, the wrestlers, to fight with Dāmodara and Saṅkarṣaṇa, and goes to the palace to witness the fight. He reminds the prize-fighters to do their utmost to discharge their obligations. Kaṁsa then sends for Dāmodara and Saṅkarṣaṇa and after their entry the duels begin. Dāmodara and Saṅkarṣaṇa fight respectively with Cāṇūra and Muṣṭika and kill them. Then Dāmodara ascends the mansion, catches Kaṁsa by the head and strikes him down dead. Kaṁsa's army is up in arms against Dāmodara and Saṅkarṣaṇa. Saṇkarṣaṇa goes out to meet the army. But Vasudeva enters and informs the citizens of Mathurā that both the youths are his own sons. Dāmodara and Saṅkarṣaṇa make their salutations to their father and he blesses them. The dead bodies are removed and the old king Ugrasena is ordered to be released from the prison and is crowned king of Mathurā. The divine music is sounded, and it rains flowers to honour the destroyer of Kaṁsa. King Ugrasena is brought on the stage and finally there appears

Nārada. Dāmodara offers him *arghya* and *pādya*. The divine sage identifies Dāmodara with Nārāyaṇa, pays his respects to the Lord and goes back to the heavens. The usual epilogue ends the play. (Act V).

Deviations. As the precise source of the *Bāl* is not known, it cannot be stated to what extent the poet is indebted to the oral traditions about Kṛṣṇa. The miracle of the divided waters is the poet's invention as found in the *Abh.* Dr. Winternitz says that some of the miraculous incidents are found embodied in so late a work as the *Premasāgara*;[1] this shows that most probably they are invented by the author of the play especially as they are not found recorded in the *Purāṇas* or the *Harivaṁśa*. Non-mention of Rādhā and the absence of the erotic element take the *Bāl* to a very early period.[2] In the story as we get it in the *Mbh* and the *Purāṇas*, Kṛṣṇa is stated as the eighth issue; the daughter of Nanda Gopa is not apparently dead at first. The miracles of the light emanating from the child, of the divided waters, and of the waters rushing out of the ground,—which are some of the feats of Kṛṣṇa, are not found in the accounts of Kṛṣṇa as we have them in the *Harivaṁśa*, the *Purāṇas*, and the *Mbh*.

Type of drama. The *Bāl* is a *Nāṭaka*, based on a *prakhyāta* plot, the hero being *dhīrodātta*. Though there are some female characters in the play, there is no heroine and no *Śṛṅgāra*. In showing the fights, struggles and deaths on the stage, the *Bāl* contravenes the direct prohibitions of the text-books on dramaturgy. *Saṅkarṣaṇa-kathā* serves as the secondary incident *(patākā)* to the main story of the adventures of child Kṛṣṇa.

Sentiments etc. The main sentiment is *Vīra*, and there are found at various places *Adbhuta* (the appearance of the various weapons, as also some of the supernatural feats of Kṛṣṇa); *Karuṇa* (Devaki's lamentation); *Raudra* and *Bhayānaka* (Kaṁsa's visions, terrible explosions, etc.); *Hāsya* (the old cowherd); *Śānta* and *Bhakti* (general devotion for Nārāyaṇa Viṣṇu); etc. It may be stated in general that excepting *Śṛṅgāra*, there

1 *BBRI*, 5, p. 10. 2 Cf. Konow, *Id*, 49, p. 234; Weller, Introduction, German translation, p. 13; Woolner and Sarup, Thirteen *Trivandrum Plays*, Volume 2, p. 109; Winternitz, *CR*, December 1924, p. 331.

is the play of every other sentiment in this play. The well-known simile about darkness, *viz.*,

लिम्पतीव तमोऽङ्गानि वर्षतीवाञ्जनं नभः।
असत्पुरुषसेवेव दृष्टिर्निष्फलतां गता॥

is originally from this play (I. 15). The language is most simple. According to Dr. Winternitz, "the Sanskrit is so plain and clear that it might be recommended as a first reading to the beginners in Sanskrit."[1] The verse is also simple and there are no elaborate figures of speech in this play.

Critical remarks. The *Bāl* has, like the *Pañc*, song and dance introduced in it for the sake of popular appeal and we get a glimpse into the life of the cowherds. Some general festivities such as the Indramaha and Dhanurmaha are referred to in the play. The spirited heroes, Dāmodara and Saṅkarṣaṇa, remind one of Abhimanyu in the *Pañc.* The appearance of the weapons is met with in the *Dv*, and Nārada in the *Avi.* The low caste women, Curse etc. in the second act of the *Bāl* remind one of the similar scene in the *Macbeth* (Act I. scene 3). The whole pastoral atmosphere in the cottages of the cowherds with all their songs and dance in the third act of the *Bāl* is similar to that painted in the second and third scenes in the fourth Act of the *Winter's Tale.* When Kaṁsa is nearing his doom, his Rājaśrī leaves him (*Bāl*, Act II. pp. 24-25); similarly lady Laṅkā leaves Rāvaṇa in the *Abh* (Act V. 4, 5, p. 60). A curious blend of ferocity and mildness, as noticed by Dr. Woolner, is to be met with in this play.[2] Thus, *e. g.* a dead child left on the ground revives (Act I. p. 20); it is crushed against stone but it rises up before our eyes (Act II. p. 31); Ariṣṭarṣabha though slain on the stage and Kāliya though hauled out of his pool, feel themselves honoured in that the Lord Kṛṣṇa Himself was dealing with them (Act III. p. 46; Act IV. pp. 53-54). The excitement consequent on the slaughter of Kaṁsa is soon quietened (Act V. pp. 64, 66). Somewhat analogous to this is the device, already noted in the *Ūru*, of raising the passions to the highest pitch, to the breaking point so to speak, and then to find some outward diversion to bring down the tension.

---

1 *BRRI*, 5, p. 10. 2 *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Volume 2, p. 111.

The same high regard is found for the Brāhmaṇas that is the peculiar feature of the plays of this group. The effects of darkness are described in I. 16 and III. 19, the latter of which is bound to appeal to the cowherds. Devakī's condition after entrusting her child to Vasudeva is happily described in I. 13 :

हृदयेनेह तत्राद्धैर्द्विधाभूतेव गच्छति ।
यथा नभसि तोये च चन्द्रलेखा द्विधाकृता ॥

II. 13 lays down the general rule of conduct at the same time indicating the momentary nature of the kingly whims :

स्मरतापि भयं राज्ञा भयं न स्मरतापि वा ।
उभाभ्यामपि गन्तव्यो भयादप्यभयादपि ॥

The tendency to use alliteration and *yamakas* is found in this play also, though to a small extent. Cf. I. 6 : शोकार्ता शशिवदना निशि प्रशान्ता । II.6: सीवर्धकान्ततरकन्दरकूटकुञ्जम् । I.8: नारायणाय नरलोकपरायणाय । V.7:...कृतलोहमुष्टिं, तं मुष्टिना मुष्टिकमथ रुष्टम् । That the use of the *Raṅgaśīrṣa* and *Raṅgapīṭha* was required for the staging of the last act has already been dealt with while describing Bhāsa's stage.

CHAPTER VIII

THIRTEEN BHĀSA PLAYS (*Continued*).

As compared with the plays considered in the last Chapter, those that are dealt with in the present Chapter may be said to show somewhat successful attempts of the poet in executing dramas proper. The prologues themselves bear ample testimony, as in all the plays in this Chapter both the stage-manager and his mistress are to be met with. In the earlier plays, only the stage-manager appears, his assistant in addition appearing only in the *Abh* and the *Ūru*. The *Svapna* has only the stage-manager in the prologue, but there are strong grounds to presume that the prologue in the *Svapna* has not been faithfully preserved.

AVIMĀRAKA.

Title. The play gets its name from its hero who is called Avimāraka though his name was Viṣṇusena, because of his being the killer of (māraka) the demon who had assumed the form of a goat (*avi*). Cf. *Avi*, II. 9.

Plot. The stage-manager recites the benedictory stanza in praise of Nārāyaṇa and calls his wife, who expresses a desire to go with him to the public garden for some religious function. That very moment it is learnt that the princess was in the garden and that the elephant was in rut. So the stage-manager tells his wife to wait till the princess left the garden as there were placed sentries all around. Then they both leave the stage, and the main scene opens with king Kuntibhoja entering with his retinue. The king has a daughter who has attained

the marriageable age and hence he is always in search of a suitable match for his daughter. He sends for his queen and after her arrival opens the subject of the marriage, stating that marriages are to be entered into after considering the question from all its aspects. Some noise is heard behind the curtain and the queen feels anxious about her daughter, who had gone to the public park. Kauñjāyana, the minister, enters the stage dilating on the worries and dangers of his high office, and approaches the King and the Queen. He tells of the mad elephant rushing towards the chariot of the princess and of her rescue at the hands of some unknown youth, who is then attacked by the elephant. Kauñjāyana spins a lengthy yarn of the affair and is often asked to be precise and relevant. He tells that Bhūtika arrived on the spot in the meanwhile and the princess was immediately rushed out to the palace. On enquiries, Kauñjāyana learns that the unknown youth proclaims himself to be a low-caste person, at which the queen remarks that a low-born person cannot have such a compassionate nature. Just then, Bhūtika who had gone to get particulars about the rescuer of Kuraṅgī, the princess, enters the stage and he also feels certain that the person is concealing his identity. He confirms Kauñjāyana's account and further tells that, after rescuing the princess, the youth at once left the place as if feeling shy and uncomfortable at the praise showered on him. Bhūtika managed to tie down the elephant in its stable and proceeded to the residence of the youth. The divine splendour, sweet tongue, martial valour, delicacy, and strength of the youth convinced Bhūtika that the young man is not low-born. Bhūtika further informs the king that he learnt of the youth being yet unmarried and that the youth's father also was quite noble and royal in appearance. The king orders further investigations to be made in connection with the young man and resumes the question of Kuraṅgī's marriage. He seeks the advice of the ministers as to what steps he should take in regard to the messenger from Kāśirāja, and Bhūtika advises to act as it best suits the time and occasion. Kauñjāyana, however, mentions that out of the numerous suiters, Kāśirāja and Sauvīrarāja only were related to the royal family, being the brothers-in-law of the king himself; so in the choice between the two, the

king himself, continues Kauñjāyana, is the best judge. But the king asks for his frank opinion from Bhūtika and he votes in favour of Sauvīrarāja as the latter was, in addition, the brother of the queen. The king also indicates his preference for Sauvīrarāja ; and on the king enquiring as to why no envoy has been sent subsequently by Sauvīrarāja, Bhūtika informs that both Sauvīrarāja and his son are reported to have disappeared ; no cause is known, the ministers rule there and no one is granted entry into the royal palace there. The king orders further investigations in this matter also and asks what message should be sent to the ambassador from Kāśirāja. Kauñjāyana says that the ambassador should be honoured and the decision should be postponed. Just then the beating of the drum announces the time for the royal bath ; and the king has further to console Kuraṅgī and meet his subjects. While he prepares to go he refers to the heavy burden and onerous duties of the king. (Act I) :

धर्मः प्रागेव चिन्त्यः सचिवमतिगतिः प्रेक्षितव्या स्वबुद्ध्या
प्रच्छाद्यौ रागरोषौ मृदुपरुषगुणौ कालयोगेन कार्यौ।
ज्ञेयं लोकानुवृत्तं परचरनयनैर्मण्डलं प्रेक्षितव्यं
स्वस्थो यत्नादिहात्मा रक्षगिरसि पुनः सोऽपि नावेक्षितव्यः ॥१२॥

The interlude introduces us to Vidūṣaka, the Brāhmaṇa friend of the hero, who informs us that Avimāraka, ever since he saved the princess from the tusker, has fallen deeply in love with her. A maidservant in the Sauvīra household fools Vidūṣaka and disappears with his ring. The whole scene is full of boisterous humour. Then enters Avimāraka, brooding over the beauty of the princess. The more he tries to forget her the more ardently does the memory return to h i m. Meanwhile, the princess Kuraṅgī also is in a similar plight and her nurse and the maid Nalinikā after knowing her love-lorn condition decide to visit the young man's abode. On their way a divine voice tells them of the youth being of high noble birth, and that encourages them in their mission. They find Avimāraka alone and engaged in meditating on the princess. They tell him of the unhappy, pitiable condition of Kuraṅgī and invite him to the Kanyāpura in disguise at night, to save the life of the princess. This gladdens Avimāraka and infuses new spirit in him. He learns the details of the

Kanyāpura, the guard placed there, etc. from them. They give him a ring to convince him of their bonafides. He asks them to wait for him at midnight, and the nurse and Nalinikā depart. Vidūṣaka as usual comes back home at the fall of night. He has heard in the market place of the visit of the maids from the royal household to Avimāraka's house. Avimāraka informs him of the whole affair and of his appointment that night, and asks for his consent. Vidūṣaka presses Avimāraka not to go alone on the dangerous mission, but at last allows him to go. He suggests that they both should wait till the appointed hour in a friend's house in the city. Avimāraka agrees and decides that after meals he should enter his sleeping chamber and secretly slip out of it to the friend's house in the city. As it was sunset and time for his night bath, Avimāraka gets up on being called by his maid. The cover of darkness over the whole world presents everything to him as if in a changed dress. (Act. II).

The same evening that the nurse and Nalinikā had gone to meet Avimāraka, Kuraṅgī and her two maids, Vilāsinī and Magadhikā, enter the stage and after some conversation which discloses that Kuraṅgī was indisposed, they all go up the royal terrace where a bed for Kuraṅgī has been prepared. She, however, rests on a stone-slab and learns from the conversation between the maids that the envoy from Kāśirāja, who had come for asking Kuraṅgī in marriage, has been sent back along with Bhūtika, and that the marriage has been postponed as the queen feels that her daughter is still young and hence the separation would be unbearable. This is a happy news for Kuraṅgī. Then Nalinikā comes on the scene after visiting Avimāraka and tells the princess in her ears of the success of her mission, and suggests that the youth seems to be born of noble family. This satisfies the princess, who then enters the inner apartments, with Nalinikā to serve her. Avimāraka in the guise of a thief, sword in one hand and rope in the other, then enters the stage and engages in a long monologue in which he describes the city at night, step by step according as he comes on different spots. Thus, in darkness he meets the city-guards on the way, hears some music, comes across the light in the market place, meets a thief, rests awhile in the gambling house, and

stands before the royal palace. He finds Kapiśīrṣas at various places on the palace walls, throws his rope up which gets fixed to a monkey-head and with the help of the rope, ascends to the top of the palace wall. The same rope helps him to descend, and then he throws it in the elephant's stable. Walking a little distance, he finds the Mandākinī, Dāruparvata, Upasthānagṛha and finally reaches the Kanyāpura Prāsāda. He sees much woodwork therein, finds the windows quite near the ground and ascends it. Coming across the mechanical door referred to by the nurse and Nalinikā, he opens it by the magic key and effects his entry into the Kanyāpura Prāsāda. Then he throws away the thief's clothes and his girdle and dons his usual dress, and presents himself before Nalinikā, who was waiting for him. The princess is half asleep and Nalinikā goes to awaken her, but Avimāraka stops her. Kuraṅgī in the same semi-drowsy state asks Nalinikā to embrace her. Nalinikā tells Avimāraka to embrace the princess in her stead and she herself massages the body of the princess. The princess gives a loving embrace to the person standing, but finds a second one massaging her body. She at once opens her eyes when Nalinikā utters something in her ears. Kuraṅgī stands abashed and exclaims that her reputation is spoilt. But Avimāraka pacifies her. The nurse then enters and informs that the beds were ready inside and asks Nalinikā to direct Avimāraka and Kuraṅgī to that place. Nalinikā accordingly requests Avimāraka and leads them both to the sleeping-chamber. (Act III).

The interlude explains that Avimāraka stayed in the apartment of the princess for a year. But afterwards everything was discovered. The king came to learn of the presence of some youth in the Kanyāpura Prāsāda, stiffened the guard and restricted and prohibited the entrants to the apartments of the princess. Avimāraka, finding his stay in the palace most risky, made good his escape. At this sudden separation the princess became exceedingly disconsolate. Seized with fear and shame on the one hand and the pang of separation on the other, she was withering like a helpless creeper. All the maids shared in her sorrows and tried to console her. The only relieving factor was that

Avimāraka could leave the palace in safety. The main scene opens with Avimāraka wending his way, grieving on account of Kuraṅgī and her hapless condition. He is physically troubled by the excessive heat of the sun which was burning the whole world. Avimāraka feels much exhausted through his exertions, heat, and want of food, and is unable to proceed any further. Thoughts of suicide enter his mind but drowning is rejected as being contrary to the religious precepts. He finds a forest-conflagration nearby and enters it to offer the oblation of his life, but, lo! the fire does not burn him; on the other hand it becomes cool like the Malaya winds and embraces him as a father does his son. Then he comes across a high precipice and decides to end his life by throwing himself down below, and engages himself in b a t h, meditation and other preliminary rites suitable for the occasion. A Vidyādhara couple enters the spot on its way to the Malaya mountain. Meghanāda and Saudāminī (the husband and wife) have started from Mānasa lake and coming across various places descend there on the mountain to rest awhile, and collect flowers, etc. They find Avimāraka engaged in meditation, and the latter sees them when he attempts suicide. In reply to Avimāraka's enquiry, Meghanāda tells all about himself and his wife and then naturally asks Avimāraka to give his own particulars. The latter's replies being not sufficiently satisfactory he resorts to his magical science and comes to know thereby of Avimāraka's p a r e n t a g e etc. Thereafter they become friends and the Vidyādhara offers to help Avimāraka to gain an entrance into the impenetrable Kanyāpura. A magic ring is g i v e n rendering the wearer and any one touching him invisible. Avimāraka convinces himself of the efficacy of the ring and is extremely pleased. He thanks the Vidyādhara and the latter promises to help him at the mere thought. The couple then leaves for the Agastya ceremony, and Avimāraka starts for Vairantya. Feeling tired, Avimāraka rests on a stone seat, and near about under the shade of a tree he finds his friend Vidūṣaka asleep. The latter is searching for Avimāraka. Both are glad at meeting each other, and Avimāraka tells his f r i e n d of his recent acquisition. Without wasting any time, they decide to go to the Kanyāpura a n d r e a c h

there in no time through the help of the magic ring. (Act IV).

Ever since her separation from Avimāraka, Kuraṅgī is feeling much grieved, and the various means by which her maids try to please her add to her discomfort. The day on which Avimāraka starts for the Kanyāpura, Kuraṅgī is again despondent and to relieve her mental pain she goes up to the terrace with Nalinikā. The thunder and lightning make her long for Avimāraka, and she sits looking at the sky. Then enters Avimāraka with Vidūṣaka and he finds Kuraṅgī seated with Nalinikā. She appears to Avimāraka much emaciated; she has painted sandal-paste, etc. on her body and is shorn of all ornaments, etc. They both stay there invisible to the two maidens. Kuraṅgī in the meanwhile gets disconsolate and thinks of ending her life. She sends Nalinikā to prepare her bath, and Nalinikā leaves Kuraṅgī only after another maid arrives on the spot. Kuraṅgī sends that maid also on some mission. Avimāraka gets some inkling of her intention from her eyes full of tears, hot breath, etc. She expresses a desire to kill herself by fastening her upper garment tightly round her neck, and begins to do it but the terrible thunder and lightning just then thoroughly unnerve her and she cries out for help. Avimāraka at once puts the ring on his left finger which makes him visible to her and then he consoles and embraces her. Immediately she feels quite refreshed. Vidūṣaka tries to taunt and ridicule her in jest. Nalinikā then arrives on the scene but is shocked to find the door bolted from within. Avimāraka asks Vidūṣaka to open the door. Then follow some humorous dialogues between Vidūṣaka and Ceṭī, and finally Avimāraka tactfully sends them both away. Both the lovers are by themselves. Avimāraka extols the beauty of the rain clouds and when it actually begins to shower in plenty, the lovers retire inside for amorous sports. (Act V).

The interlude tells us that Kuntibhoja intended to give Kuraṅgī in marriage to Viṣṇusena, the son of Sauvīrarāja, who was the brother-in-law of Kuntibhoja and also the brother of his queen. But Sauvīrarāja was not heard of for a year, and Kāśirāja had sent an envoy on behalf of his son for Kuraṅgī's hand

in marriage. So Kuntibhoja at last made arrangements for Kuraṅgī's marriage with Kāśirāja's son and the marriage party had arrived in the capital of Kuntibhoja—all excepting Kāśirāja, who was engaged in a sacrifice. On the day of their arrival, Kuntibhoja learns from the ministers of king Sauvīrarāja that their master with his family had been staying in secret in Vairantya (capital of Kuntibhoja) for the last year. Kuntibhoja makes investigations through the secret service and is at last successful in finding him out. The main scene opens with King Kuntibhoja, King Sauvīrarāja and Minister Bhūtika. Both the kings embrace each other, but on seeing Sauvīrarāja with a sorrowful face and eyes full of tears, Kuntibhoja asks him the reason thereof, which the former states to be the loss of his son. To divert his mind from the painful thoughts, the minister asks Sauvīrarāja the how and why of his exile. Sauvīrarāja then tells them the details of the curse which the great sage Caṇḍabhārgava had pronounced on him. Sauvīrarāja was to live like a *cāṇḍāla* for one year according to the curse, and that very day marked the end of the curse. Then the story is told how prince Viṣṇusena came to be called Avimāraka on account of his killing, when quite a boy, a giant named Dhūmaketu. Sauvīrarāja tells them that he expected that with his efficient secret service, Kuntibhoja could easily find out the whereabouts of Avimāraka; but the minister, Bhūtika, replies that all his efforts had so far been fruitless, and so it appeared that the prince was hiding somewhere through some *Māyā*. The divine sage Nārada who comes to know through his superior power of the difficulties facing Kuntibhoja and Sauvīrarāja by the disappearance of Avimāraka, arrives on the scene to put things right. All present pay their respects to the sage, whose feet have been washed and worshipped by the water brought on the stage. Nārada then calls in Sudarśanā, the mother of Jayavarman, son of Kāśirāja. Nārada tells them that Avimāraka at that time was staying in the same house with them and was already married to Kuraṅgī, the daughter of Kuntibhoja. He explains that the love-marriage was already celebrated according to the Gandharva form, but for the satisfaction of Kuntibhoja and all, it is decided to perform the

ceremony in the presence of the sacred fire. Kuntibhoja then tells of his difficulty, in that he had already given his word for the marriage of his daughter Kuraṅgī with Sudarśanā's son Jayavarman. Nārada asks him to wait a little and calls Sudarśanā aside, and explains to her the divine origin of Avimāraka, who was born of Agni to Sudarśanā herself. Sudarśanā had exchanged her child with the dead son of her sister Sucetanā. Then Sudarśanā is told the story of the curse, the elephant episode, the entry of Avimāraka in the Kanyāpura and his escape therefrom, his attempt to commit suicide, the ring incident, and Avimāraka's staying in the palace. Nārada then finds out an agreeable solution that would save both Kuntibhoja and Sudarśanā from their awkward position caused by the impossibility of carrying into action the previously arranged marriage of their respective issues. The divine sage suggests that Kuraṅgī was already married to Avimāraka, and also that she would be rather old for Jayavarman; so her younger sister Sumitrā should be offered in marriage to Jayavarman. Then enter on the stage Avimāraka in his marital dress, Kuraṅgī, and Bhūtika. Avimāraka feels a bit ashamed of his conduct. All are very happy at his sight. He pays his respects to all the elders present and they suitably bless him. The usual prayers for the happiness of the cows and the Brahmins and of all the subjects, and the protection of the whole earth by the king, bring the play to its close. (Act VI).

Deviations. If, as appears likely, the main story has been taken by the poet from the folklore of his day which was afterwards recorded in the *Bṛhatkathā* and the *Kathā Sarit Sāgara*, we find that the poet has effected some changes and added some particulars of a somewhat formal character, such as the introduction of Nārada, the starting of Avimāraka on his dangerous mission, the description of the city at night, the entry of Avimāraka in the guise of a thief in the Kanyāpura and his subsequent flight from it, etc.[1] The ring incident is of course the creation of the poet, and it enables him to make a popular appeal by recourse to magic in which

[1] See Supra, Chapter IV (J)—"Sources of the play;" also *IA*, 1931, pp. 113-115.

the public believed in those days. The character of Vidūṣaka is exclusively the invention of Bhāsa, which was mainly responsible for earning for him the title of हासः. It may be that Śakāra is the exaggerated development of this braggart Santuṣṭa.

Type of drama. The *Avi* is a full-fledged drama *(Nāṭaka)* and it will be seen that it answers the requirements in major details. It is a perfect comedy. The *Aṅguliyaka Kathā* is the secondary incident *(patākā)*, so also is the *Vidūṣaka Kathā*. Dr. Winternitz takes the *Avi* to belong to the *Prakaraṇa* type along with the *Svapna*, *Pratijñā* and *Cār.*[1] The *Avi* does not fulfil the essential conditions of a *Prakaraṇa* with regard to the plot, the hero, and the presence of Viṭa, Śakāra, Kuṭṭinī, Ceṭa and others as enjoined by the *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa.*[2] No doubt, the nurse is there but her character is quite different from that expected of the Ceṭī type required in a *Prakaraṇa*. The *Svapna* and *Pratijñā* can never be called *Prakaraṇas* as they do not answer any special characteristic of the *Prakaraṇa*.

Sentiments etc. *Śṛṅgāra* and *Hāsya* are the main sentiments, and occasionally there are employed *Karuṇa* (the descriptions of Kuraṅgī and Avimāraka in separation; their attempts at suicide, etc.); *Adbhuta* (meeting with Vidyādhara and getting the magic ring from him; the story of Avimāraka's birth; etc.); *Bhayānaka* (various trials through which Avimāraka passes before his entry into the Kanyāpura); etc. There are a number of beautiful similes in this play to be met with at many places. Special mention may be made of II. 12; III. 4; IV. 11. II. 13 is an *Utprekṣā* describing the various-natured world, which has changed its dress as it were at the approach of night:

श्यामद्युतिस्तिलकितो विततोडुमालो
नष्टातपो मृदुमनोहरशीतवातः।

---

1 *Problems*, p. 113; Tatke, *MS*, 5, p. 165, also takes the *Avi* to be a *Prakaraṇa*, as the plot according to him, is imaginary (कविकल्पित). We think the poet has drawn on the popular folklore. Taking the plot to be the poet's creation, however, the *Avi* does not answer many of the requirements of a *Prakaraṇa* as stated above. Cf. the definition of a *Prakaraṇa* given in this chapter later on under "Cārudatta (d) Type of Drama." 2 Cf. *Bhāvaprakāśana*, GOS, No. 45, p. 242 lines 18-19.

संलीनकामुकजनः प्रविकीर्णचोरो
वेषान्तरं रचयतीव मनुष्यलोकः ॥

This is how darkness is described (III. 4):

तिमिरमिव वहन्ति मार्गनद्यः
पुलिननिभाः प्रतिभान्ति हर्म्यमालाः ।
तमसि दृश दिशो निमग्नरूपाः
प्लवतरवीव इवायमन्धकारः ॥

"The poetic merit of *ojas*," observes Dr. Ganapati Sastri, "is here [*i. e.* in the *Avi*] embedded with that of *mādhurya* and *prasāda* at suitable places."[1] There are a number of *Arthāntaranyāsas* and other figures in prose as well as in verse; a mere glance at the list of *subhāṣitas* appended towards the end, will reveal many fine illustrations from the *Avi* as well as other dramas in our group. Hence references to those passages are deemed unnecessary.

Critical Remarks. The first act of this play reminds one of the similar domestic scene in the *Pratijñā* (Act II). The queen's natural feelings are skilfully brought out. The third act consists of a lengthy monologue which supplies us with a realistic description of the city at night. This is probably the only play in this group where there are so many verses devoted to the descriptions of nature. We get much information about the court-life, the duties of the king (I. 12) and the heavy responsibilities of the ministers (I. 5). The description of the different parts of the palace and the strictly guarded Kanyāpura are found to conform strictly to the rules laid down in that respect by Kauṭilya. The laying out of the city as also of the market-place, residences, etc. in different quarters, the gaming-house, the city-guards and the palace-guards etc. tell us much about the life of those days. We shall deal with the sociological conditions of the period at some length later on, and the above points will be fully considered there. It is shown that there are many similarities and parallelisms between this play and the *Romeo and Juliet*.[2] Kirāta, however, states that the minister Kauñjāyana in the *Avi* reminds him of Polonius from the *Hamlet*.[3]

1 *Avi*, preface, p. 1. 2 VJV, 1917, pp. 161-168. 3 Marathi trans., Intr., p. 176.

Prof. Devdhar charges the poet with having stooped " to write of the importunate longings of the flesh that drive young people to illicit ways " in the *Avi*.[1] It is to be noted in this connection that the nurse and Nālinikā enter the residence of Avimāraka, only after they are convinced by the divine voice that Avimāraka is not in reality what he outwardly appeared to be (II. 5). The king and his ministers are also shown to be in doubt as to how a number of noble qualities could be found in a mere out-caste youth. Kuraṅgī is depicted as a god-fearing maiden, acting according to the moral rules of conduct of those days. She is afraid of her character and good name being spoiled (p. 40 इदं हीयं चारित्तं ।). The maids, however, tell her of the divine voice and then she consents. We are further to take into consideration that the Gandharva form of marriage was prevalent in those days. Still Avimāraka is shown feeling a bit ashamed for his conduct in not following the more recognized form of marriage in the presence of fire (107). The love that is shown to exist between the couple is not the fleeting vagary of the flesh, but constant and everlasting. The explanations of Nārada and his approval of the marriage should leave no shadow of doubt in our mind as to the righteousness of the love affair. Nārada further advises the solemnization of the marriage on a grand scale with the fire as the witness. So, we have no hesitation in overruling the objections of Prof. Devdhar and we declare the *Avi* as a drama of pure love. The secret visit of Avimāraka to the Kanyāpura at the dead of night is " preparatory to the Gandharva marriage between the lovers and could be construed as imparting the moral that even men of heroic type and of sterling character are in danger of being lured by the siren temptation of cupid, and that one should be well guarded against such temptations".[2] The presence of the erotic element which is absent in other plays of the group may be justified on the ground that the play is the product of the poet's youth, and he was not dealing with grand themes such as the epic generally presented. Dr. Raja declares the *Avi* to be decidedly a weak imitation of the *Mālati-Mādhava* in diction, plot and characters.[3] The fact that

1 *Plays etc.*, p. 64. 2 Dr. G. Sastri, *Pratimā*, Intr., p. 36 ; *Critical Study*, p. 76. 3 *ZII*, 2, p. 263.

Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra*, which is placed not later than the fourth century A. D., definitely refers to the *Avi* is strongly against Dr. Raja's assertion, as Bhavabhūti, the author of the *Mālatī Mādhava*, is certainly not earlier than the seventh century A. D.[1] Internal evidence also does not support the view; it is almost unlikely and against the nature of things and the accepted principles of human conduct and progress that the later writer should always show bad judgment. The relationship between the *Cār* and the *Mṛcch* is an illustration in point.

PRATIMĀ.

Title. This drama is based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, but any one familiar with the epic would not be able to come at any particular incident that the name signifies since it is wholly invented by the poet. Bharata, who comes from the court of his maternal uncle at the urgent call from Ayodhyā and is resting for a while outside the city, is told all the details of the tragic and cruel death of his father very skilfully through the erection of the statue-house (*Pratimā-gṛha*) in which an image or life-size statue (*pratimā*) of Daśaratha is placed along with his three ancestors. It is said that the statues of only dead kings were erected. Bharata thus learns of the sad event without being directly told about it, and also comes to know the important part played by his mother in that incident. The play is called the *Pratimā Nāṭaka* or the Statue Drama because of the important part played by the statues.[2] Prof. Dhruva suggests that *Pratimā Daśaratha* is the original name of the drama and that the *Pratimā* is its mere contraction.[3] But there is no manuscript evidence in support of this view.

Plot. After reciting the benedictory stanza in which the names of the principal *dramatis personæ* are introduced, the stage-manager calls his mistress and asks her to sing a song of the autumn. The mistress

---

1 Cf. Banerji Sastri, *JBORS*, 1923, p. 55-57; Chakladar, *Social Life in Ancient India*, p. 33. 2 So, Ganapati Sastri and others. Prof. Devdhar (*Pratimā*, Poona, 1930, Intr., p. XI) suggests that the drama may have been named *Pratimā* as Bharata "is represented as the very *pratimā* of Daśaratha", and very similar to Rāma so as to create illusions on various occasions in the minds of Devakulika, Sumitrā, Lakṣmaṇa, Sītā etc. Prof. Chapekar (*Mauj*, Marathi Weekly, Bombay Divāli Number, 1931, p. 18) also sees the same subtle meaning in the "*Pratimā*." 3 *Pratimā*, Ahmedabad, Intr., pp. 12-13; also *Sraṣṭnant Sundari*, 1923, p. 23 No. 41.

accordingly sings and the stage-manager passes some remarks on the autumn when from behind the curtain are heard the words "Oh Lord! Oh Lord!", which the stage-manager recognizes as those from the palace portress, and the couple then leaves the stage. The portress calls the chamberlain and asks him to hurry up with the preparations for the coronation of Rāma. He replies that everything was already arranged,—the royal umbrella, the consecration waters, and the sacred chair, were ready; His Holiness Vasiṣṭha and the ministers and the citizens were all assembled. The chamberlain then hastens to the sacred place and the portress, after ordering the preceptor and the actors etc. to be ready, goes to inform His Majesty that everything had been arranged. Then enters Avadātikā carrying a *valkala* (bark garment), which she had removed in jest from Ārya Revā, the mistress of the concert-room, in order to punish her for refusing her request. Sītā then appears with her maids and learns of Avadātikā's mischief. She asks her to return the bark garment. When, however, Avadātikā is about to go, Sītā takes the garment and puts it on for mere fun. A maid is sent to bring a mirror. The maid enters with it and tells her ladyship of some coronation about which the chamberlain was muttering. Another maid comes with the good news of Rāma's coronation and receives some jewels from Sītā for the happy tidings. The sound of a drum is heard but suddenly it ceases and all get anxious. Then Rāma appears on the stage wondering why the people were astonished at his calmness in leaving the throne at his father's word. The absence of any change in his usual dress is a mystery to all in view of Rāma's coronation. Then Rāma tells Sītā how his coronation was cancelled after going through some ceremonies, when Mantharā whispered something in His Majesty's ear, and lo! he was no more a king. Then Rāma asks Sītā why she had removed her ornaments and put on the bark garments. He is told that she wore them out of mere curiosity. He then expresses a desire to have one for himself, but Sītā prevents him as it was ominous in view of the recently cancelled coronation. Then the chamberlain brings the news that the king had fainted because of the grief at Kaikeyī's distressing demands. She had prevented Rāma's coronation for the sake of getting her

son Bharata installed on the throne. Rāma, however, justifies the conduct of Kaikeyī as being not due to any ulterior motive, and asks the chamberlain to stop his insinuations against her. Then agitated, much perturbed and angry Lakṣmaṇa makes his entry with bow and arrows in hand, intent on ridding the world of womankind. He tells Rāma that the desire for the kingdom was not the cause of his angry outburst; it was the forest exile for fourteen years which had been enjoined upon Rāma that had unnerved him. Rāma then knows that this had thrown his father in a swoon and he asks for the bark garments, which Sītā readily gives. Rāma decides to go to the forest, and Sītā, as the ideal wife is determined to accompany her Lord. Rāma tries to dissuade her, but Lakṣmaṇa supports her. Then enters a maid with new bark garments, which Rāma puts on. Lakṣmaṇa prays to Rāma to allow him to share the bark garments and forest life with him, and to serve him there. Rāma tries to prevent him at first, but at Sītā's request consents to take Lakṣmaṇa with him. The trio with the bark robes on sets out for the forest led by Lakṣmaṇa. Sītā removes her veil at Rāma's behest so that the citizens assembled may freely have a look at her. The chamberlain enters with the news of the coming of the broken-hearted king to prevent them from entering the forest. They, however, avoid him and proceed on their way. (Act I).

The interlude in the form of a conversation between a portress and a chamberlain informs us of the sorry plight of king Daśaratha and the citizens of Ayodhyā after the departure of Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā. The king is stated to be in a delirious state, lying in the Samudragṛha, attended by Kausalyā and Sumitrā; he rises and falls down, is continuously wailing and gazing in the direction by which the trio had left. The main scene opens with the king, thus frail in body and mind, attended by the two queens. The king is feeling the pangs of separation more and more, and always working himself to a climax. He can neither control his grief nor can suffer it. He is thus out of his senses and cannot recognize the persons near him. In reply to his query Kausalyā says that Rāma would soon return to console Daśaratha, but he asks her who she was. In his talk with Sumitrā also he talks incoherently. He has no other subject but the memory

of the trio that had left him and the condemnation of Kaikeyī and himself. The chamberlain brought the news of the return of the minister Sumantra; but Daśaratha in the foolish hope of the return of the exiles, asks whether he had come with Rāma, and on being told in the negative falls down swooning, saying that the empty chariot brought back by Sumantra had been, as it were, sent by the God of Death to carry himself (Daśaratha). To Sumantra he puts questions bringing out the virtues and qualities of his children and rebuking himself. Their mere names are as if a solace to Daśaratha. He is constantly thinking of Rāma, the dutiful son, Lakṣmaṇa, the devoted brother, and Sītā, the shadow of her Lord. Sumantra tells him that the trio alighted from the chariot at Śṛṅgiverapura and stood for a while facing Ayodhyā. They paid their homage to Daśaratha and stood contemplating for long and finally departed to the forests without speaking any words. This proves too great a disappointment and a serious blow to the king and he falls into a deep swoon. He recovers but partly from it and leaves a message full of irony and sarcasm for Kaikeyī. Then he gets a vision of his ancestors who come to console him. With the names of Rāma, Vaidehī and Lakṣmaṇa on his lips, Daśaratha leaves his mortal coil. His body is covered with a sheet, all mourning the death. (Act II).

The Sudhākāra (professional white-washer) who enjoys a little nap after completing his work, and the soldier who rebukes and beats him, provide us with some humour and constitute the interlude to the next act. The interlude informs us of the preparations made in the statue-house by whitewashing the walls, decorating the door-ways with garlands and wreaths, clearing the dove-cotes, spreading white sand over the paths, and scattering flowers, in view of the intended visit of the queen-mothers to the statue-house. Bharata himself opens the main scene with his charioteer and a chariot. He says that his long stay with his uncle had made him a perfect stranger to Ayodhyā and that he simply knew of his father's serious illness. Bharata questions the charioteer about the state of the king's health, but the latter, by his evasive replies, depicts the dead king, which Bharata understands in a different sense. He, however, is much disturbed at

getting no definite information, feels restless at what he hears, and orders the driver to speed up to Ayodhyā. The speed of the chariot diverts the attention of Bharata, who beautifully describes the picture of the flying trees, the flooded river, the steady wheels, etc. On reaching the out-skirts of Ayodhyā, Bharata pictures to himself what he would find at Ayodhyā,—his falling at the feet of his father, his being soaked in the tears of his mothers, his being praised by his servants, his being mocked at by Lakṣmaṇa for a queer dress and accents,—most of which comes true, alas, in a different sense ! The charioteer feels much sympathy for his master, but he cannot divulge the truth as the three evils (*viz.*, his father's death, his mother's greed and his brother's exile), would be more than a shock to him. Just then, a soldier enters requesting Bharata, under the instructions of the preceptor, to wait outside the city till the unexpired period of Kṛttikā is complete and the influence of Rohiṇī commences. Bharata agrees to it, gets down from his chariot and dismisses the charioteer for a while. He decides to rest in the temple (which in reality was the statue-house) which he sees in the avenue of the trees. The special preparations which he finds in the temple such as the anointing of the walls by sandal paste, garlands, sand and parched grain, etc., suggest to Bharata that it is a day of some temple festivity. But the absence of any outward sign, such as the banner or weapons of the deity, fails to inform him of the particular deity enshrined in the temple. Entering it, he finds four stone-statues beautifully executed with expressive features proclaiming the skill of the sculptor. Bharata even takes the temple to be of four deities and proceeds to bow down his head. The priest (Devakulika), who enters after his meals, finds a person similar in features to the statues (*viz.* Bharata) making ready to offer obeisance to the statues, and he prevents the latter by stating that the images were not idols of any deities but the statues of the kings of the Ikṣvāku family. Bharata is glad at learning that and praises his ancestors. Then he asks the priest about each of the statues and is told in turn about Dilīpa, the embodiment of Dharma; Raghu, the embodiment of charity; and Aja, the embodiment of love. The fourth statue Bharata recognizes as that of his

father, but is afraid of the worst, feels agonized, and to ward off the unpleasant news for a time at least, asks the priest to repeat what he had said earlier. He adds comments to the names pronounced by the priest, stating that Dilīpa was the great grandfather of the king (*viz.*, Daśaratha), Raghu, the grandfather of the king, and Aja, the father of his (*viz.*, Bharata's) father. Coming again to the last statue he wavers a little, and asks the priest whether the statues of living kings also were erected. The latter replies in the negative; truth dawns upon Bharata's mind, his suspense is over, and he bids adieu to the priest. But the worst is yet to follow, and the priest asks Bharata why he does not inquire about the statue of Daśaratha, who parted with life and kingdom for the sake of the dowry contract. The information proves a veritable shock to Bharata and he falls fainting to the ground but recovers again. From the exclamation 'Ārya' from Bharata's lips the priest takes him to be a scion of the Ikṣvāku family, and coming to know that he was the mighty Bharata himself, the priest prepares to go. But now Bharata stops him and asks for the rest of the news. The priest then tells him of the death of Daśaratha and the exile of Rāma with Sītā and Lakṣmaṇa. The latter news makes Bharata swoon doubly, but after recovering he demands of the priest full details of the whole affair without any reservation. But no sooner does the priest begin his story by telling of the installation of Rāma on the throne than Bharata anticipates the whole course of events and states in the main outlines everything including the part played by his mother. He concludes by referring to the heaping of abuse which might have naturally been showered on him by the subjects. This is too much for Bharata and he faints again. At that precise moment is announced the entry of the queens led by Sumantra. Seeing the young prince lying prostrate, Sumantra without recognizing Bharata, asks the queens not to enter. The priest after telling Sumantra that the stranger is Bharata, makes his exit. Bharata recovers, but apparently continues his conversation with the priest not knowing of his exit and the entry of the new comers. Then Bharata infers about the identity of Sumantra from the latter's good manners. On being told by Sumantra to pay respects to Kausalyā and Sumitrā

in response to Bharata's request for advice as to the order of bowing to his mothers, Bharata offers his obeisance to them and is suitably blessed by them. Sumantra then announces Kaikeyī but in righteous indignation Bharata rises up and states that she does not deserve to stand betwixt his two mothers. To Kaikeyī's question as to what she had done, Bharata sums up all the results of Kaikeyī's evil deeds—infamy to him, bark garments to Rāma, death to father, incessant tears to the whole of Ayodhyā, forest life to Lakṣmaṇa, sorrow to mothers, fatigue of travel to Sītā, and the severest scorn to her own self (III. 17). Kausalyā points out to Bharata, the prince of formalities and decorum, his inconsistency in not honouring his own mother ; but Bharata disowns his mother and pronounces a new dictum that "a mother forfeits the mother's claim by her treachery to husband" (III. 18 भर्तृद्रोहादस्तु माताप्यमाता ।). Kaikeyī justifies herself on the ground of the fulfilment of the dowry contract, but Bharata is not satisfied and passes cruel remarks against her. To his question as to whether the exile of Rāma was also stipulated in the contract, Kaikeyī says that she would clear her position at the proper place and occasion. Bharata, however, subjects his mother to wholesale condemnation, accusing her of having wrought the whole havoc for personal gain. Sumantra then announces that Vasiṣṭha, Vāmadeva and others had come for Bharata's coronation ; but Bharata pungently remarks that her ladyship (Kaikeyī) deserved the honour of coronation and declares his intention of going to Rāma, as Ayodhyā without him (Rāma) was no Ayodhyā, and that real Ayodhyā was where there was Rāghava (III. 24 नायोध्या ते विनायोध्या सायोध्या यत्र राघवः ।). (Act III).

The interlude, wherein two maids of the harem carry on a conversation, informs us that Bharata's noble resolve to follow Rāma has endeared him to all in Ayodhyā and made his mother more hated, and that Bharata has started for the penance grove of Rāma. The main scene opens with Bharata and Sumantra in a chariot with a charioteer. Bharata is in supreme haste to see his noble brother and on reaching the hermitage, they get down from the chariot and the charioteer is asked to get away to give repose to the horses. Bharata proposes two modes of announcing himself to Rāma, but Sumantra objects to

both as in the first (राघवस्योच्चायाः कैकेय्याः पुत्रः) his mother is vilified, and in the second, Sumantra cannot declare Bharata as the stain of the Ikṣvāku race (इक्ष्वाकुकुलकन्यन्नमूतः). So Bharata declares himself as an ordinary, unkind, ungrateful—but devoted—person come to see Rāma. Hearing the voice, the exiled trio is wonder-struck and feels some affinity to the speaker from his voice, and Rāma sends Lakṣmaṇa to see who the stranger was. Lakṣmaṇa learns of the identity after being introduced by Sumantra. After saluting Lakṣmaṇa and being blessed in return, Bharata expresses his impatience to see Rāma. Lakṣmaṇa goes in, announces Bharata to Rāma, who sends Sītā to receive him. Owing to the close similarity in the features of the brothers, Sītā for a moment mistakes Bharata for her Lord. Bharata pays respects to her and noting the similarity in the voices of the brothers, she blesses him. Then Bharata enters the hermitage led by Sītā, Sumantra waiting outside. After blessing Bharata who salutes him, Rāma puts Bharata at ease by asking him to embrace, and thus gladdens him. Sumantra's entry at this stage reminds Rāma of Daśaratha and he feels pained. Sumantra sorrowfully takes his long life as a curse as it were, as it lingers even after experiencing great shocks. Rāma's eyes are full of tears and he asks Lakṣmaṇa to bring water to wash his face. Bharata goes instead and returns with water. Rāma sips it and remarks that Lakṣmaṇa's right to serve him was impeded, to which Sītā replies that Bharata could as well wait upon Rāma. Rāma admits the right of both, but desires that Lakṣmaṇa should serve him in the forest and Bharata in the city (by ruling the kingdom). Bharata catches the true significance of Rama's words and says that he could carry on Rāma's task even by staying in the forest, as the kingdom could be protected from there simply by Rāma's name. Rāma, however, draws the attention of Bharata to the fact that he had come to the forest in pursuance of the order of the father, and that veracity was the heritage of the Raghu family. Sumantra then asks as to who is to be crowned king, and Rāma states that Kaikeyī's desire be fulfilled in the matter of coronation. Bharata feels stabbed in his heart as it were, and appeals to Rāma that they both are of the same family and that the mother's fault

should not be attached to her sons (IV. 21. पुत्राणां मातृदोषो न दोषो।). Sītā also pleads in Bharata's favour. Rāma is visibly affected, feeling sorry that Daśaratha was not present to witness the devotion of Bharata; but he further adds that he was quite helpless in the matter as the behest of the king must be executed and the good name of the family maintained. Bharata then requests to be allowed to be by Rāma's side; but Rāma replies that this also could not be done as the kingly duties had to be properly performed. Bharata agrees to go back on condition that Rāma would take charge of the kingdom after his return from exile. Rāma accepts it. Bharata again asks the gift of Rāma's sandals, of which he intends to be the regent during Rāma's absence. Rāma grants this request also. After getting the sandals Bharata desires to crown them by sprinkling the coronation water upon them and Rāma asks Sumantra to do as Bharata wished. Bharata is immensely pleased and thinks that now he has done the right thing and has risen high in the public estimation. As the kingdom is not to be neglected even for a single day, Rāma asks Bharata to leave without any delay and the latter is willing to start forthwith. Rāma requests Sumantra to protect Bharata; and Bharata and Sumantra ascend the chariot in Rāma's presence. Rāma, Sītā, and Lakṣmaṇa accompany Bharata as far as the door of the hermitage. (Act IV).

The fifth act describes the saddest part of the whole of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, *viz.*, the capture of Sītā. The scene opens with Sītā and a female ascetic in the Janasthāna. Sītā is shown to be quite at home in the new atmosphere and her new duties, such as sweeping the hermitage, worshipping the gods and sprinkling water over the forest shrubs and trees.[1] Then enters Rāma steeped in sorrowful thoughts. He is pained at the thought of the deserted city of Ayodhyā and of noble Bharata, who alone has to bear the burden of the crown though they are four brothers. To divert his attention from these sad thoughts, he approaches Sītā, whom he finds watering the plants, and he feels a pang at the sight of the delicate woman unaccustomed to any work doing hard labour. Sītā finds her Lord troubled with sorrow and asks him

1 There ought to be a stage direction as to the exit of the Tāpasī at the entry of Rāma.

the reason. Rāma replies that the approaching *śrāddha* ceremony of his father the next day was worrying him, and he was anxious as to how to celebrate it suitably. Sītā suggests that the ceremony may be performed as befits the circumstances,—Bharata would celebrate it in a right royal fashion, while Rāma may perform it with fruits and water available in the forest. Rāma replies that the main reason of his anxiety was how to ensure the happiness of his father ; his father would be reminded of his forest life by seeing the fruits on the *kuśa* grass and would shed tears in heaven. Rāvaṇa, in the guise of an ascetic, then descends on the stage. He declares his intention to carry off Sītā after deceiving Rāma, to avenge the murder of Khara. He then approaches the door of Rāma's hermitage and announces himself as 'a guest'. Rāma welcomes the guest, and after saluting him, offers him a seat. Rāma then asks Sītā to bring water to wash the feet of the new comer, and Sītā returns with water. At the command of Rāma, Sītā goes to wait upon the ascetic, but the latter being afraid that his disguise may be known at her approach, exclaims, " Enough of it ! " Rāma himself offers to serve the guest, but Rāvaṇa says that good words are the best reception of a guest, and asks Rāma to be seated. Then Rāvaṇa introduces himself as belonging to the Kāśyapa gotra and enumerates various sciences studied by him, such as the *Veda* with its aṅgas and upāṅgas, the *Dharmaśāstra* of the Mānavas, *Yogaśāstra* by Maheśvara, *Arthaśāstra* by Bṛhaspati, *Nyāyaśāstra* (the science of logic) by Medhātithi, and the *Śrāddhakalpa* (the ritual of the *śrāddha*) by Prācetas. Rāma evinces special predilection for the ritual of *śrāddha* and states that he is anxious to know how the manes are gratified at the *śrāddha* ceremony. Rāvaṇa passes a general remark by stating that anything given with *śraddhā* (faith) constitutes a *śrāddha*. Rāma desires to know about the special offerings, and Rāvaṇa mentions various offerings among different objects, such as *darbha* amongst grass, sesame amongst the herbs, *Kalāya* among the vegetables, etc., and stops at वा, indicating thereby that there was something else in addition also. Rāma desires to know what that was and resolves to perform the ceremony by that object alone, and Rāvaṇa after stating that it could be procured by

prowess, mentions the object as काञ्चनपार्श्व (golden deer), which generally is found in the Himalayas. Rāvaṇa further states that the manes are immensely pleased by such offerings, and Rāma decides to go forthwith to hunt one for the *śrāddha* ceremony, and asks Sītā to prepare to accompany him. Rāvaṇa tries to prevent him, saying that it was an impossible feat for human beings. But Rāma replies that if they existed at all he would have one at any cost. At that precise moment a flash of lightning is seen, and lo! the golden-flanked antelope makes its appearance to Rāvaṇa. Rāma takes the good luck to be due to the merits of his father and tells Sītā to ask Lakṣmaṇa to go in pursuit of the antelope. On learning that Lakṣmaṇa had already been sent to receive the Kulapati, Rāma himself sets out to capture the antelope, telling Sītā to serve the guest in the meanwhile. After the departure of Rāma, Rāvaṇa praises the strength, valour, and speed of his adversary and sees the antelope enter the thickest part of the forest. Sītā feels afraid to stay in the presence of the guest and starts to enter the hut, when Rāvaṇa resumes his original form and commands her to stop. Rāvaṇa tells her of himself and of his intention to carry her off. Poor and helpless, Sītā shouts for help from Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa. Then Rāvaṇa proudly boasts to her of his prowess and feats of having vanquished Indra, Kubera, Yama, etc. In reply to Sītā's prayers for help from Rāma or Lakṣmaṇa, Rāvaṇa states that nothing would avail her; and he asks her to look upon him as her Lord. This is too much for the chaste lady and she curses him. The mere words मत्तो सि burn Rāvaṇa. He then catches hold of Sītā and proclaims the challenge to Rāma. Jaṭāyu, the vulture friend of Daśaratha, hearing of Rāvaṇa's challenge rushes in the direction of Rāvaṇa to assault him with his terrible beak. Rāvaṇa also proceeds against the vulture with drawn sword. (Act V).

Two old hermits in the penance-grove observe Sītā being forcibly carried away by Rāvaṇa, see that Jaṭāyu challenges Rāvaṇa, and witness the great ærial fight that ensues between the two resulting in the death of the vulture. The hermits then proceed to communicate the news to Rāma. The main scene opens in Ayodhyā, where the chamberlain orders Vijayā, the female door-

keeper, to inform prince Bharata of the arrival of Sumantra from Janasthāna after visiting Rāma ; and the door-keeper accordingly leaves the stage. The chamberlain finds Bharata approaching, wearing bark garments and having matted hair, eagerly awaiting the news from Sumantra. Then enter Bharata and the Pratihārī, and Bharata orders the chamberlain to usher Sumantra at once, and both the servants make their exit. The door-keeper then leads Sumantra, who is again grieving at his long life as he has heard one more misfortune in the form of the loss of Sītā. Bharata asks Sumantra whether he had seen devotional Rāma, the replica of Arundhatī, *viz.*, Sītā, and the fraternal love incarnate, *viz.*, Lakṣmaṇa. Sumantra tries to circumvent and tells him that the trio had left Janasthāna. He further tries to keep back the news from Bharata, but while telling of Rāma's friendship with Sugrīva (who was deposed by Vālin, the kidnapper of his wife, and who had made mountains his residence) blurts out the truth inadvertently —'तुल्यदुःखेन' मोचितः (VI. 10)—(Sugrīva) was relieved 'by Rāma who was in an identical predicament.' Bharata asks Sumantra the meaning of "the identical predicament," and the latter hesitates; but he had to yield when Bharata adjures him by the feet of the dead king to tell the truth. When Bharata learns of the kidnapping of Sītā, he faints. After recovering, the sad plight of Rāma and the suffering of the separation heaped upon the hardships of Rāma's forest life pain Bharata. Then Bharata leads Sumantra to the court of the queens and orders the door-keeper to announce his approach to her ladyship, "who desires me to be king" (p. 116 या मां राजानमिच्छति।). The door-keeper then tells Kaikeyī of the return of Sumantra and the desire of Bharata to see her, but she is in suspense as to the particular connection in which Bharata wishes to reproach her. She, however, orders the door-keeper to usher Bharata in, and Bharata and Sumantra are ushered in. Kaikeyī asks Bharata whether Sumantra had come from Rāma. But Bharata replies that he had some good news for her. Asked whether Kausalyā and Sumitrā be called to hear it, Bharata says that they are not to hear it. Kaikeyī feels something amiss, and the good news proves to be the abduction of Sītā, by which Bharata

says, "your wishes have been fulfilled (VI. 13 पर्याप्तस्ते मनोरथः।), and the noble Ikṣvāku family has the misfortune to find its daughter-in-law (Sītā) outraged by having Kaikeyī for daughter-in-law." Kaikeyī then feels that the time was now ripe to explain everything and asks Bharata whether he knew of Daśaratha's curse. Bharata knows nothing about it, and at Kaikeyī's behest Sumantra tells the story how Daśaratha killed through mistake the only son of a blind sage who cursed him that Daśaratha too would die through the grieving for his son. Kaikeyī then states that in order for the curse to operate, she had to effect the separation of the son; and Bharata being always away, was already separated. With regard to the period of exile for fourteen years, Kaikeyī explains that she meant to say "fourteen days" but through confusion she said 'fourteen years.' She further tells Bharata that even Vasiṣṭha, Vāmadeva and others knew the whole thing and assented to it. Bharata then sees that his mother was right and prays her to forgive him. She readily forgives him, as "what mother will not forgive her son for his faults?" (p. 121 का णाम मादा पुत्तअस्स अवराहं ण मरिसेदि।). Then Bharata rises to take her leave and declares his intention of arousing the whole circle of princes to help Rāma and with the crossing troops turn both Rāvaṇa and the ocean pale through fear. Some noise is heard from within, which proves to be due to the fainting of the senior queen after hearing the news. Both mother and son start to comfort the noble lady. (Act VI).

The interlude opens in the hermitage after the conclusion of the great war resulting in the death of Rāvaṇa. A hermit informs Nandilaka of the order of the Kulapati to make ready to receive Rāma who was coming after having killed Rāvaṇa and crowned Bibhīṣaṇa, and who was surrounded by the chiefs of bears, demons, and monkeys, and accompanied by Sītā. Nandilaka is afraid lest the demons should eat them, but is comforted to learn that the demons were under the control of noble Bibhīṣaṇa. Rāma then opens the main scene and speaks of the fulfilment of his vow. He is waiting for Sītā, who has gone inside to pay her homage to the hermit women. Sītā enters with a hermit woman. They both cast a glance at their former residence in Janasthāna. The trees —the foster-children of Sītā—are taller and grown

up. They recollect some familiar incidents and visit the familiar scenes; and the memory of the gold-flanked deer for the *śrāddha* ceremony frightens Sītā, who trembles with fear. Rāma reassures her, and looking round, finds huge clouds of dust in the air and hears the sounds of conch-shells, drums and the cries of warriors. Lakṣmaṇa enters and announces the approach of eager and devoted Bharata with the mothers, accompanied by a large army. Bharata, who is full of joy, enters with his mothers. The exiled trio pays homage to the mothers and receives their blessings. Bharata then embraces his brothers and salutes Sītā and is blessed by them. He asks Rāma to shoulder the burden of the kingdom; and Kaikeyī states that it was the long cherished desire of all. Then enters Śatrughna, who salutes the exiled trio and receives blessings from it. He announces the desire of Vasiṣṭha and Vāmadeva and the public to see Rāma crowned with holy water brought by the sages. Kaikeyī asks Rāma to go in for his coronation and he makes his exit. Many triumphal proclamations are heard from behind the curtain. Kaikeyī and Sumitrā refer to the priests, ministers and servants celebrating Rāma's victory. Further proclamations of victory are heard from behind the scenes. Rāma then enters after his coronation with his followers. Looking overhead, he asks his father to cast aside his cares and rejoice in the heavens as his wishes were fulfilled. Bharata and Śatrughna are mightily pleased, and Lakṣmaṇa congratulates Rāma upon his obtaining the kingdom. The chamberlain announces that Bibhīṣaṇa, Sugrīva, Hanuman, Nīla, etc. craved for permission to offer their congratulations. Rāma sends them a message that it was through their assistance that fortune smiled on him. Kaikeyī desires to see the coronation ceremony again performed in Ayodhyā. Rāma says that she would see it. Then Rāvaṇa's aerial car Puṣpaka comes hovering in the sky making the forests bright. Rāma asks all to get into it and they all proceed to Ayodhyā that very day. The prayer in the epilogue states: May our king be united to glory, and rule the earth in the same way as Rāma was united to Sītā and his brothers. (Act VII).

Deviations. We have purposely given the plot of

the *Prat* at some length in order to enable the readers to find for themselves the changes introduced by the poet in the story of the epic. The *valkala* incident in the first act and the presence of Śatrughna at the coronation are the poet's innovations.[1] The second act brings to Daśaratha on his death-bed the vision of his ancestors who have come to carry him off to the region of the manes. The third act (in which Bharata is shown as younger than Lakṣmaṇa) dealing with the statue-houses is exclusively the creation of our poet, as also the novel method of abduction by bringing Rāma and Rāvaṇa together and making the golden deer necessary for the *śrāddha* ceremony of Daśaratha; Lakṣmaṇa has been kept out. Then Sumantra is again made to visit Daṇḍaka after Sītā's abduction and the scene between Bharata and Kaikeyī after hearing the news, and Kaikeyī's explanation of the curse and her slip in saying 'years' instead of 'days', Bharata's preparing for an expedition with a large army to vanquish Rāvaṇa,—are the innovations in the sixth act. The coronation of Rāma in the forest where Bharata, his mothers, and the citizens from Ayodhyā attend, as also Bibhīṣaṇa, Sugrīva, Hanuman, etc., and Rāma's assuming the reins of government, and the journey of the whole assembly to Ayodhyā in the Puṣpaka æroplane for celebrating the ceremony on a grand scale,—are the deviations in the last act. There are similar changes in characterization also. All the characters in the *Prat*, though quite human, appear on an elevated plane as compared with the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Thus, *e. g.*, Rāma has been shown more noble and dignified and more devoted to his father by his leaving for the forest without any ill comment, and by making him hunt for the golden deer for the sake of *śrāddha*, instead of in obedience to his wife's wishes, as pictured by the *Rāmāyaṇa*, cf. II. 21. 57-59; 22. 12-13; III. 43. 9-21; 24-50.

गुरुश्च राजा च पिता च वृद्धः कोपात् प्रहर्षादथवापि कामात्। | आर्यपुत्राभिरामोऽसौ मृगो हरति मे मनः। आनयैनं महाबाहो क्रीडार्थं नो भविष्यति ॥३.४३.६॥

1 Prof. Paranjape proposes to read Śatrughna as "the vanquisher of the enemies" (*Pratimā*, Poona, 1927, notes, p. 91); but to us the views expressed by Prof. Pisharoti (*QJMS*, 11, p. 364; 12, p. 385) seem to be sound. There is no necessity for the poet to follow the epic; and again Bharata's speech (Act III, p. 58, किं शत्रुघ्नो मामभिगतः ?) renders it probable that Śatrughna was at Ayodhyā while he was visiting it after being summoned there after his father's death. Cf. also Devdhar, *Pratimā*, Poona, 1930, notes, p. 64.

यद् ब्रूयादिक्ष्वाकुकुलोचितं धर्मं
कस्तत्र कुर्यादनृशंसवृत्तिः ॥२.२१.५९॥
मम प्रव्रजनादद्य कृतकृत्या नृपात्मजा ।
सुतं भरतमव्यग्रमभिषेचयतां ततः ॥२.२२.१२॥
मयि चीराजिनधरे जटामण्डलधारिणि ।
गतेऽरण्यं च कैकेय्या भविष्यति
मनः सुखम् ॥२.२२.१३॥

अहो रूपमहो लक्ष्मीः स्वरसम्यच्च शोभना ।
मृगोऽद्भुतो विचित्राङ्गो हृदयं हरतीव मे ॥१५॥
पश्य लक्ष्मण वैदेह्याः स्पृहां मृगगतामिमाम् ।
॥२५॥
यावद्गच्छामि सौमित्रे मृगमानयितुं द्रुतम् ।
पश्य लक्ष्मण वैदेहीं मृगवक्षि गतस्पृहाम् ॥४८॥

Sītā also does not scold Rāma, and the scene after Rāma's going out for the golden deer between Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā, in which Sītā appears quite an ordinary woman not showing her regal characteristics in expostulating with Lakṣmaṇa, has been eliminated from the drama by making Lakṣmaṇa altogether absent.[1] Kausalyā has no anger or jealousy for Kaikeyī and Bharata which we witness in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[2] Kaikeyī is also shown nobler, her sending Rāma into exile being shown to be due to her acting in obedience to the curse pronounced on Daśaratha; though her explanation as to her slip in stating the period is not satisfactory as the text stands; it proclaims the attempt of the poet to present Kaikeyī in a favourable light. Sumantra is quite a different person from the bitter, caustic-tongued Sumantra of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[3]

Type of drama. The *Prat* is a full-fledged *Nāṭaka*, based on renowned plot, having a *dhīrodātta* hero. The

---

1 *Rāmāyaṇa* II. 30. 3, 8 :

किं त्वामन्यत वैदेहः पिता मे मिथिलाधिपः ।
राम जामातरं प्राप्य स्त्रियं पुरुषविग्रहम् ॥३॥
स्वयं तु भार्यां कौमारीं चिरमध्युषितां सतीम् ।
शैलूष इव मां राम परेभ्यो दातुमिच्छसि ॥८॥

also, *Rāmāyaṇa*, III. 45. 5-8 ; 21-27 ; 36-38. 2 Cf. *Rāmāyaṇa*, II. 75. 11, 12, 16 :

इदं ते राज्यकामस्य राज्यं प्राप्तमकण्टकम् ।
सम्प्राप्तं बत कैकेय्या क्षिप्रं क्रूरेण कर्मणा ॥११॥
प्रव्राज्य चीरवसनं पुत्रं मे वनवासिनम् ।
कैकेयी कं गुणं तत्र पश्यति क्रूरदर्शिनी ॥१२॥
इदं हि तव विस्तीर्णं धनधान्यसमाचितम् ।
हस्त्यश्वरथसम्पूर्णं राज्यं निर्यातितं तया ॥१६॥

3 Cf. *Rāmāyaṇa*, II. 35. For the difference in the characterization between the *Prat* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, cf. Dhruva, *Pratimā*, Abd., Intr., pp. 8-11 (पात्रोनुं उचीकरण) ; and V. Ramayya, *QJMS*, 17, pp. 136-141.

secondary incident (*Patāka*) of *Bharata Kathā* is skilfully woven into the main plot. It is mainly because the drama receives its name from the statue-scene and also because of the importance of Bharata in the main story that the statue-scene is introduced which helps Bharata to proceed forthwith to the forest without stepping into Ayodhyā (which was not Ayodhyā in the absence of Rāma); thus there is no interruption in the main story. Hence the statue-scene is in place from psychological as well as dramatic point of view; character and passion are beautifully delineated. And it is not correct to say that "its [*i. e.*, of the statue-scene] intrusion into the play is dramatically a mistake";[1] since our interest in the main story and the leading characters is not allowed to be distracted; they are always there though in the background.

Sentiments etc. There is some difference of opinion as to the principal or the central sentiment in the *Prat.* Dr. Ganapati Sastri states it to be "the *Dharmavira* mingled with *Karuṇa rasa*—the *Dharmavīra* manifesting itself in the enthusiasm displayed by the hero in cherishing the single thought of carrying out the *dharma*, *i. e.*, fulfilling the mandates of his royal father".[2] Prof. Dhruva, however, gives the prime importance to *Karuṇa rasa*,[3] and we think that the main sentiment is the pathetic one; every incident in the play goes to help it in some way or the other. The interlude to the third act coming immediately after the death of Daśaratha is intended to relieve the tragic atmosphere to some extent by supplying us with humour.

There are a number of instances of various figures of speech in this, the largest, and one of the best productions of Bhāsa. We content ourselves with citing here a few notable examples of some figures. It is remarkable that Rāma is always compared with the moon in this play.[4] The *valkala* incident provides with *Tadguṇālaṁkāra* (p. 12 सोवण्णिअं चिअ वक्कलं संवुत्तं।) and *Sasandeha alaṁkāra* (I. 9):

आदर्शे वल्कलानीव किमेते सूर्यरश्मयः।
हसितेन परिज्ञातं क्रीडेयं नियमस्पृहा॥

1 Johnston, *IA*, 62, p. 99. 2 *Prat.*, Intr., pp. 2-3. 3 *Pratimā*, Abm., Intr., pp. 6-7. 4 Cf. Devdhar, *Pratimā*, Poona, 1930, notes, p. 61.

Lakṣmaṇa's mistaking Bharata for Rāma on account of the similarities of their forms (IV. 8) is another fine instance of *Sasandeha*. I.8 is a beautiful illustration of *Anumānālaṁkāra* :

कच्चौ स्वरापहृतभूषणशुभ्रपाणौ
संलक्षिताभरणगौरतलौ च हस्तौ।
पृतानि चाभरणभारनतानि गात्रे
स्थानानि नैव समतामुपयान्ति तावत् ॥

Bharata's anticipations on reaching Ayodhyā supply us with *Svabhāvokti* :

पतितमिव शिरः पितुः पादयोः क्षिप्यतेवास्मि राज्ञा समुत्थापितः।
त्वरितमुपगता इव भ्रातरः क्लेदयन्तीव मामश्रुभिर्मातरः ॥
सदृग इति महानिति न्यायतश्चेति भृत्यैरिवाहं स्तुतः सेवया।
परिहसितमिवात्मनस्तत्र पश्यामि वेषं च भाषां च सौमित्रिणा ॥३.३॥

अनपत्या वयं रामः पुत्रोऽन्यस्य महीपतेः।
वने स्याध्री च कैकेयी त्वया किं न कृतं त्रयम् ॥२.८॥

is *Paryāyokta*, and the description of the world as seen from a running chariot (III. 2), reminding one of a similar verse in the *Vikramorvaśīya* (I. 5 ; cf. also *Śākuntala*, I. 9) is an *Utprekṣā*. Daśaratha's condition at the separation of Rāma (II. 1) is also a beautiful *Utprekṣā* :

मेरुश्चलेदपि युगक्षयसन्निकर्षे
शोषं व्रजेदपि महोदधिरप्रमेयः।
सूर्यः पतेदपि च मण्डलमात्रलक्ष्यः
शोकाद् भृशं शिथिलदेहमतिर्नरेन्द्रः ॥

The devoted wife following her Lord through thick and thin is effectively described in the following *Arthāntaranyāsa* (I. 25) :

अनुचरति रथाङ्गं राहुदोषेऽपि तारा
पतति च वनवृक्षे याति भूमिं लता च।
त्यजति न च करेणुः पङ्कलग्नं गजेन्द्रं
भजतु चरतु धर्मं भर्तृनाथा हि नार्यः ॥

The different aspects of the *valkalas* as required in different circumstances are cleverly expressed in I. 28, an instance of *Mālāparamparita Rūpaka* :

तपःसङ्ग्रामकवचं नियमद्विरदाङ्कुशः।
खलीनमिन्द्रियाश्वानां गृह्यतां धर्मसारथिः ॥

Bharata's comparing himself to a thirsty traveller going to an empty river is a beautiful *Upamā* (III. 10):

अयोध्यामटवीभूतां पित्रा भ्रात्रा च वर्जिताम् ।
पिपासार्तोऽनुधावामि क्षीणतोयां नदीमिव ॥

Sītā's penance of watering plants (V. 3) comparable with a similar verse in the *Śākuntala* (I. 16) illustrates *Upamā*, *Arthāntaranyāsa* and *Sahokti*:

बोऽस्याः करः भ्राम्यति दर्पणेऽपि
स नैति खेदं कलशं वहन्त्याः ।
कष्टं वनं स्त्रीजनसौकुमार्यै
समं लताभिः कठिनीकरोति ॥

Viśvanātha in his *Sāhityadarpaṇa* (p. 44, Kane's edition) has given a verse similar to *Prat*, II. 12, as an instance of *Aprastutaprasaṁsā*. The verse there reads:

धन्याः खलु वने वाताः कह्लारस्पर्शशीतलाः ।
राममिन्दीवरश्यामं ये स्पृशन्त्यनिवारिताः ॥

A reference to the *subhāṣitas* given in an appendix will also exemplify many *Arthāntaranyāsas*, *Dṛṣṭāntas*, *Upamās*, *Rūpakas*, *Aprastutaprasaṁsās*, etc., from all the plays of the group.

Critical remarks. The *Prat* is an important work of Bhāsa in that it has converted many a pro-Bhāsa scholar into an antagonist. Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti who was a believer in the Bhāsa theory began to doubt its authenticity on coming across the peculiar genealogy of the Raghu family given in the *Prat*, which he took to be due to Kālidāsa's influence.[1] He found further support in the various *śāstras* mentioned by Rāvaṇa; and later on in the *Pratimā Gṛhas* (statue-houses) also, which he takes to be due to the Southern custom.[2] Now, with regard to the genealogy, we have already shown that Bhāsa need not necessarily be indebted to Kālidāsa for that. The same genealogy is found in the *Harivaṁśa*, the *Brahmapurāṇa* and the *Padmapurāṇa*.[3] Medhātithi's *Nyāyaśāstra* has been shown to be a book on logic and not the commentary on *Manusmṛti*; and the custom of erecting statue-houses obtained in the North also. The discovery of human heads and statues among the Mohenjo-Daro excavations proves the custom of erecting

1 *QJMS*, 13, pp. 603-604. 2 *QJMS*, 14, p. 47; *BSOS*, 3, p. 109 n2.
3 Cf. Paranjape, *Pratimā*, Intr., pp. XXXV-XXXVI.

statues of men, as distinct from images, to be one of hoary antiquity.[1] In the *Prat*, as in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the whitewash, the flowers and other preparations in connection with the statue-houses do not countenance the southern origin and a late date for the *Prat*. We have discussed these points at length earlier in this book. Prof. Pangu objects to some of the innovations by Bhāsa as not being skilfully executed and as being contrary to life.[2] The *śrāddha* episode has been given as an instance. As compared to the *Rāmāyaṇa* contrivance to make Rāma leave Sītā in the Āśrama, Bhāsa's picture is certainly superior as it brings the two adversaries face to face, and presents Rāma as going out for the purpose of securing the choicest offering to his father at the *śrāddha* ceremony, emphasizing Rāma's devotion to his father. With regard to characterization we have shown that there is a substantial attempt by the poet at elevating the characters. Prof. Pisharoti is quite right in bringing out the noble traits in Bharata's character and pronouncing them to be quite in keeping with the Indian mentality.[3]

Making a survey of the *Prat*, act by act, we are wonder-struck by the artistic development of the plot by skilfully presenting the familiar incidents in a different light, and by the talent of the poet in bringing various dramatic incidents and ironies, and in raising the passions to high tensions and then giving them a new turn. In the first act is brought out the irony of situation created by the *valkalas*, which, put on by Sītā for mere fun, prove to be the dress for herself and for Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa for a long time to come. The incident enhances the tragic pathos in its cumulative effect. The fruits of Kaikeyī's part in the affair, *viz.*, the king's swooning and his sanctioning Bharata's coronation and Rāma's exile, are gradually introduced, greatly enhancing the dramatic effect. Rāma's justification of his mother's conduct tones down the passion in some measure, but the entry of angry Lakṣmaṇa with his retort to the elders reminding one of Bhīma in the *Veṇī*, again raises the tension to a high pitch. It is calmed down again by the natural composure with which the trio accepts the tragic

1 *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization*, pp. 44, 856-300.
2 *Chitramayajagat*, Poona 1927, p. 475. 3 *QJMS*, 13, p. 606.

situation. The second act "depicts in truly dramatic style the passing away of Daśaratha" and supplies, according to Prof. Pisharoti, "the only purely tragic picture in the whole range of Sanskrit dramatic literature."[1] Here again, as already noted in the *Dgh* and *Bāl*, the incidents are described as reaching a climax a number of times, each being followed by some relieving feature. In this act, each stage resulting in the swooning of the king, who is shown as temporarily reviving twice, prepares us for the final catastrophe ending in the king's death. The king's utterances in this scene enhance its tragic effect. The silent message of the trio brought in by Sumantra, *viz.* (II. 17):

कमप्यर्थं चिरं ध्यात्वा वक्तुं प्रस्फुरिताधराः ।
बाष्पस्तम्भितकण्ठत्वादनुक्त्वैव वनं गताः ॥

is the most expressive one, rarely equalled in dramatic literature. It shows that verbal expression is insufficient to adequately describe the feelings: they can be experienced only by the heart,—they are only स्वसंवेद्य. Daśaratha's condition at the separation of his sons and daughter-in-law stands comparison with the heart-broken king Lear shocked by the scornful and contemptuous treatment of his selfish and cruel daughters.

Immediately after depicting the tragic death of Daśaratha, is introduced a humorous scene between a warrior and Sudhākāra (the whitewasher), which may be compared with the entry of the porter and his subsequent speeches with Macduff in the *Macbeth* (Act II, Scene 1) following the murder of Duncan. The third act is the pivot of the whole drama from the point of dramatic technique. The picture, the charioteer draws of Daśaratha's condition is a masterpiece (III, 1).

भरतः— पितुर्मे को व्याधिः
सूतः— हृदयपरितापः खलु महान् ।
भरतः— किमाहुस्तं वैद्याः
सूतः— न खलु भिषजस्तत्र निपुणाः ॥
भरतः— किमाहारं भुङ्क्ते शयनमपि
सूतः— भूमौ निरशनः ।
भरतः— किमाशा स्याद्

1 *QJMS*, 13, pp. 62-63.

सूतः — दैवं
भरतः — स्फुरति हृदयं बाहव रथम् ॥

Bharata's mental anguish is also beautifully described. The news of Daśaratha's death is very cleverly and dramatically conveyed to Bharata through the contrivance of the statue-house, and the temple priest bluntly tells him of Rāma's exile and Kaikeyī's part in the whole affair. A reference to the plot of the *Prat* given above will clear everything in this respect, bearing ample testimony to the skill and wonderful knowledge of human psychology displayed by our poet. The queen-mothers are introduced at the opportune moment and Bharata's resolve to disown his mother and to follow Rāma in the forest is gradually made known. Bharata's scorn and the harsh treatment meted out by him to his mother (Act III, pp. 69-73; Act VI, pp. 117-118) remind one of the similar treatment of Gertrude at the hands of Hamlet (Act III, scene 4). The meeting of the brothers brings out the best traits in the character of Bharata. There is not much of action in this act; there are no stirring incidents, no dramatic contrivances,—the whole atmosphere is subdued. The main concern of the poet in the fourth act is character-delineation and he has successfully achieved it by means of character and passion contrast. This act is important from another point in that the genealogy of the Raghus mentioned in this act, as already stated, sowed the first seeds of suspicion in the mind of Prof. Pisharoti. The characterization again is at the root of the changes introduced in the next act, which presents the blind lover (*viz.*, Rāma) of the *Rāmāyaṇa* as the ideal son, motivated by the desire to offer a rare oblation at the *śrāddha* by hunting the golden deer. Rāvaṇa appears as an authority on the ancient sciences and in bringing the two rivals together, the poet has shown great dramatic talent. Both are shown on a higher plane of character than their *Rāmāyaṇa* counterparts. The events leading to the final catastrophe are skilfully marshalled and there is much of action and movement in this act. The novel way of acquainting Bharata with Sītā's abduction is finely effected and again the noble aspects of Bharata's character are effectively delineated. With righteous indignation he confronts his mother, but like a dutiful son he accepts her

explanation though it does not satisfy him. The poet has tried to absolve Kaikeyī but her motives fail to exonerate her from the guilt. There is not much of action in this act. The final act brings together the whole Raghu family after Rāma's vanquishing Rāvaṇa, which is briefly referred to, for Rāma's coronation in the penance-grove. For this departure from the epic in effecting the coronation in the Tapovana, there does not appear to be any propriety or special reason unless it be to show Kaikeyī's delight in Rāma's coronation and her desire to see it gone over again at Ayodhyā. There is a substantial fall in the poet's artistic skill : this act appears to be quite flat.

According to Dr. Keith, the *Prat*, in common with the *Abh*, is a "dreary summary of the *Rāmāyaṇa*," and he further states that "the author's resource in incident is remarkable by its absence," and that the characters are stereotyped and dull.[1] We have shown above the innovations effected by the poet in the incidents and characterization of the epic, and they counter Dr. Keith's criticism.[2] Further, Dr. Winternitz says with regard to the *Prat* and the *Abh* that "compared with other Rāma dramas, for instance those of Bhavabhūti, these two plays strike us by the skill with which the poet has created the dramas full of action out of the epic story".[3] Prof. Dhruva is certainly right in his inference that the *Prat* was written by the poet in haste ;[4] but we do not think it was specially written to celebrate the coronation of his patron king. Probably it was intended to be staged on some special occasion, and the poet's obvious hurry to complete the book within a definite period is glaringly apparent in the last two acts of the play.

The deserted Ayodhyā is beautifully described in II. 2 :

नागेन्द्रा वसनाभिलाषविमुखाः सास्रेक्षणा वाजिनो
हेषाशून्यमुखाः सबृंहितबालाश्च पौरा जनाः ।
त्यक्ताहारकथाः सुदीनवदनाः क्रन्दन्त उच्चैर्दिशा
रामो याति यदा सदारसहजस्तामेव पश्यन्त्यमी ॥

1 *SD.* pp. 101, 104-105. 2 See also V. Ramayya, *QJMS*, 17, pp. 130-136. 3 *Problems*, p. 112. 4 *Pratimā*, Alm., Intr., pp. 24-25 ; also Paranjape, *Pratimā*, pp. 80-81 ; 83, 87, 88, 91, 93, 94, 96, 97, 103, 126, 135, 140, 156, etc. clearly show that somehow or other the poet could not give final touches to the play.

Rāma's sorrow in the forest on the anniversary day is pathetic :

फलानि दृष्ट्वा दर्भेषु स्वहस्तरचितानि नः।
स्मारितो वनवासं च तातस्तत्रापि रोदिति॥

न शक्नोमि रोषं धारयितुम् in similar situations appears in the *Dgh* (p. 69), the *Abh* (p. 27), and the *Prat* (p. 30).

We have already referred to the staging of some scenes in the *Prat* while dealing with Bhāsa's stage.

PRATIJÑĀ YAUGANDHARĀYAṆA.

Finally, we come to the legendary plays, of which two deal with king Udayana Vatsarāja, 'the prince Arthur of Indian literature'. Udayana legend is the most popular subject in Indian literature equalled only by the epics, and references to the legend are found in Buddhist and Jain works as also in the technical works such as Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, etc.[1] So much mass of fanciful tales has grown over the historical back-ground that it has become well-nigh impossible to arrive at the original historical basis for the legend. Guṇāḍhya's *Bṛhatkathā* is the original for the later Sanskrit works; but there are to be found many discrepancies in the story as told in the different descendants of the *Bṛhatkathā*.[2] It has been asserted that there is no historical truth behind Udayana's love for Vāsavadattā.[3] The account, as given in the Buddhist and Jain works, is much at variance with the Sanskrit version, and the legend also seems to have travelled beyond the limits of India. The whole problem bristles with important and interesting information about ancient Indian history and culture, comparative mythology, etc. We are proceeding with our investigation of the problem of the Udayana legend in all its aspects and shall publish the results when complete.

Title. The *Pratijñā* is so named on account of the vows (*Pratijñās* : I. 16 ; III. 8-9) the hero of the play,

1 Cf. Sarup, *Vision*, Intr., pp. 41-42; *Kaut. Arth.* IX. 7, p. 360; *Mahābhāṣya*, IV. 3. 87; *Kāmasūtra*, V. 4. 14; *Bṛhatkathā Śloka Saṁgraha*, Cantos 4 and 5; *Bṛhatkathā Mañjarī*, II. 1, 2; *Kathā Sarit Sāgara*, III. 1-2. 2 Gune, *ABI*, 2, pp. 1-21; Sarup, *Vision*, Intr., pp. 41-57; Lacôte, *Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā*, translated into English by Father Tabard, Bangalore, 1923; *Priyadarśikā*, Edited by G. K. Nariman and others, Intr., pp. LXII-LXXVI. 3 Ketkar, *Prachin Maharastra*, pp. 138-139.

viz., Yaugandharāyaṇa undertakes to fulfil in order to set free his master along with Vāsavadattā.[1]

Plot. Udayana Vatsarāja, the descendant of the great Pāṇḍavas was ruling at Kauśāmbī. He was an expert in the art of music, and was fond of capturing wild elephants. King Pradyota of Avantī, also known as Mahāsena owing to his great army, Vatsarāja's formidable neighbour, had a daughter, Vāsavadattā, whom he intended to give in marriage to Vatsarāja. But, Vatsarāja, 'out of sheer self-esteem', had not condescended to send any messenger for the hand of Vāsavadattā. So Pradyota had recourse to Machiavellian methods; he placed a large blue elephant in the forests adjoining the borders of his kingdom and kept concealed a body of armed soldiers nearby and thus proposed the capture of Vatsarāja, as the latter was sure to run the risk of going alone to entice such an auspicious elephant. Vatsarāja was out of his capital on a hunting expedition in the Veṇuvana on the frontiers of his kingdom, and the elephant was placed at Nāgavana, at a distance of a couple of leagues from that place. Arrangements had been made by Pradyota to inform Vatsarāja of this elephant, and Yaugandharāyaṇa, the faithful minister of Vatsarāja was also anxious to send a warning to his master about the trap laid by Pradyota. It is at this point that the play begins.

The stage-manager introduces the names of the principal *dramatis personæ* in the benedictory stanza, and calls out to his mistress to sing a song. She informs him that owing to an evil dream, she is anxious as to the safety of her kin, and requests the stage-manager to send a messenger to get news about her relatives. The stage-manager agrees, and from behind the curtain are heard the words addressed by Yaugandharāyaṇa to Sālaka, whom he is about to despatch to warn Vatsarāja of the danger, before the king had left for Nāgavana. The stage-manager and his mistress make their exit, and enter Yaugandharāyaṇa and Sālaka. Yaugandharāyaṇa tells the latter of the long way and the responsibilities and asks the female attendant to hurry with the letter

1 The shorter title *Pratijñā* may be taken to mean प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायणा नाटिका—a drama in which vow (प्रतिज्ञा) plays a prominent part. As for the alternative title *Vatsarājacarita* of which a great capital has been made in ascribing it to Śūdraka, we have already referred to it.

and the seal which the queen-mother was preparing. News is brought about the return of Haṁsaka, Vatsarāja's body-guard, alone, and Yaugandharāyaṇa sends away Sālaka to wait outside, and anxiously awaits the entry of Haṁsaka as it spells danger to Vatsarāja. In reply to Yaugandharāyaṇa's questions, Haṁsaka supplies him with detailed particulars of the capture of Vatsarāja : how after learning of Pradyota's trick the king threw aside his celebrated lute, Ghoṣavatī, and alone faced the soldiers that came out of the thicket nearby ; how he fought single-handed with the army for three or four hours and fainted owing to sunstroke ; how in his swoon he was insulted by being tied down with shrubs and how after recovery an alien soldier held the king by the hair and attempted to behead him when the soldier himself fell down ; how the chief of the enemy forces, who also was hurt, after recovering from his swoon, prevented his soldiers from molesting the king and at once cut off his bonds and treated him respectfully, and finally carried him to Ujjayinī. Haṁsaka tells Yaugandharāyaṇa that Śālaṅkāyana, the Commander-in-chief of Pradyota, had sent him to inform him (*i. e.* Yaugandharāyaṇa) of the whole affair, and also that king Vatsarāja has asked him (*i. e.* Haṁsaka) to go and see Yaugandharāyaṇa. Yaugandharāyaṇa feels delighted at the confidence in him shown by his master. Meanwhile some noise is heard and the whole harem is in mourning at the news. The female door-keeper enters with the message from the queen-mother stating that Yaugandharāyaṇa also is her son, and that her one son (Yaugandharāyaṇa) should now go out to free the other son. Yaugandharāyaṇa is much composed and in his enthusiasm pronounces his vow : "If I do not release my master, I am not Yaugandharāyaṇa." Then enters his servant with a madman's apparel and informs him of a curious happening at the *śānti* festival. A Brāhmaṇa had appeared there as a madman declaring that the royal family was to prosper ; then he vanished leaving his clothes. Yaugandharāyaṇa dons those clothes and finds his outward form transformed. So he decides to work for the release of his master in that guise. Then comes another message from the queen-mother and Yaugandharāyaṇa goes to see her. (Act I).

The interlude informs us of the arrival of many messengers at Mahāsena's court from various kings asking for the hand of his daughter in marriage, and of Mahāsena's indecision in the matter. The main scene opens with the entry of Pradyota Mahāsena with his retinue, obviously worried at the scant courtesy shown to him by Vatsarāja. He explains to the chamberlain his reasons for not arriving at a definite choice of a bridegroom as he wishes to have many qualities in the prospective son-in-law. (II. 4):

कुलं तावच्छ्लाघ्यं प्रथममभिकाङ्क्षे हि मनसा
ततः सानुक्रोशं मृदुरपि गुणो ह्येष बलवान्।
ततो रूपे कान्ति न खलु गुणतः स्त्रीजनभयात्
ततो वीर्योद्रेकं न हि न परिपाल्या युवतयः॥

He then desires to consult the queen in the matter of the marriage problem and she enters with her retinue. The queen asks him to engage a music teacher for Vāsavadattā, who had roused in her an interest for music and who was then in the concert hall taking her lessons from Uttarā. Mahāsena replies that Vāsavadattā's husband would teach her all that; and this brings from the queen her query as to Mahāsena's choice of the bridegroom. Mahāsena tells her that he has not yet made up his mind and appreciates the peculiarly awkward position of the mind of the Indian mother at the prospect of her daughter's marriage (II. 7):

अदत्तेत्यागता लज्जा दत्तेति व्यथितं मनः।
धर्मस्नेहान्तरे न्यस्ता दुःखिताः खलु मातरः॥

and says that a number of kings had so far sent their envoys. Practical and wise mother that the queen is, she replies by saying, "Give her to such a person as would never cause us to rue the day" (p. 29 जहिं दइअ ण सन्तप्पामो, तहिं दीअदु।) The king then enumerates the various royal suitors and asks the queen about her choice. No sooner the question is put than enters a chamberlain with the words 'Vatsarāja'. Mahāsena refuses to believe the news of the capture of Vatsarāja, but is overjoyed at being convinced of the truth, and exclaims एष समासः—अद्यास्मि महासेनः। (p. 32). He orders the captive to be treated in a right royal fashion. The queen is wonder-struck at the excessive delight displayed by Mahāsena, and on hearing about Vatsarāja from her husband, indicates her

preference for the young hero as he possessed all the noble qualities required in a bridegroom. After a time enters the chamberlain to deliver the celebrated lute Ghoṣavatī as the emblem of victory. The royal couple decides to make a present of that lute to Vāsavadattā. Hearing that Vatsarāja was wounded, Mahāsena orders immediate medical attendance, respectful treatment, and carrying out of all desires expressed or indicated by the royal captive. Mahāsena further orders Vatsarāja's removal to a more suitable jewel-house. To the queen's question he replies that nothing definite was settled about marriage, and that he would make no hurry in the matter. The queen then leaves for the inner apartments, and the king departs to soothe, humour, and comfort Vatsarāja. (Act II).

The third act is the pivot of the whole drama. It informs us of the plans of Yaugandharāyaṇa for releasing Vatsarāja without war. Yaugandharāyaṇa, Vasantaka, and Rumaṇvan stay in Ujjayinī in disguise and a deserted Fire shrine is their meeting place. Vasantaka's task is to see the king and to carry mutual messages. Many of their accomplices also have become residents of Ujjayinī under different disguises in the employment of Mahāsena and their plot is to infuriate a female elephant so that Udayana's help might be sought to pacify it, and then he was to mount the elephant and ride away to his capital. The first part of the act is at once humorous and suggestive, beginning with the entry of Vidūṣaka disguised as a mendicant worrying over the loss of his sugar-balls indicating his non-meeting with Yaugandharāyaṇa.[1] His soliloquy dealing with sugar-balls, old hog's bladder, the red Goddess, and other seemingly humorous things, suggests the disappointment of Yaugandharāyaṇa also at the futility of carrying out the original plot, in view of Udayana's love affair, and his message to Vidūṣaka to that effect. Yaugandharāyaṇa then enters in the guise of a madman, and Vidūṣaka's outward talk concerned with sugar-balls, Indra's elephant, and similar nonsensical matter tries to suggest Yaugandharāyaṇa of the necessity of the modification of their original plan, but the latter

1 The interpretation of the code language of Vidūṣaka, Yaugandharāyaṇa and Rumaṇvan in disguise, as given above, is in accordance with Dr. T. Ganpati Sastri's commentary to the *Pratijñā* (Second edition).

apparently does not understand it and consents to Vidūṣaka's giving out the secret signal to Rumaṇvan, who is disguised as a Buddhist monk. The trio decides on a retired place for its confabulations and enters the secret chamber in the Fire shrine, where its talk begins in the ordinary language. Yaugandharāyaṇa states that every item in the plot was quite ready: the mahouts were won over; after infuriating the elephant there were to be made loud noises and dazzling fires etc. But Vasantaka tells them of the 'love at first sight' sprung in the mind of Vatsarāja for Vāsavadattā, and the consequent transformation of the prison-house into a sport-chamber, and Udayana's consequent unwillingness to act his part in the plot. Udayana's explanatory message as to his thinking of the ways and means of wreaking vengeance on Pradyota for his humiliating treatment fails to satisfy any one of the three, and it is patent to them that the king's words display his love-sick condition and also his inability to help them in the effective fulfilment of their plot. They, however, can do nothing in the matter of Udayana's release without his consent, and finally Yaugandharāyaṇa modifies his original plan and decides to carry away Vatsarāja along with Vāsavadattā, and accordingly makes a second vow for the release of both. All the three then leave the Fire shrine by different doors as it was late and people had begun to come in the direction of the shrine. (Act III).

The interlude to the next act presents a humorous scene between an intoxicated page, who in reality is a spy of Vatsarāja. There are some Bacchic songs, which may possibly have been commonly used in drinking bouts. The page describes how he has p a w n e d Bhadravatī. After hearing of the escape of Vatsarāja with Vāsavadattā, the page casts away his disguise, encourages the Vatsa soldiers by war songs and describes the valour of Yaugandharāyaṇa, who, however, is taken prisoner of war owing to his sword being cut to pieces. All is stated to be Kauśāmbī except the wall and the banner. Then enter two warriors announcing the capture of Yaugandharāyaṇa and asking the people to keep aside. Yaugandharāyaṇa is being carried hand-cuffed, but he is neither afraid nor down-hearted, and

feels victorious now that his task is accomplished. He asks the soldiers not to keep away anybody desirous of seeing him. He gives no credence to the news of the recapture of Vatsarāja. Then Bharatarohaka, Pradyota's minister, enters after ordering the untying of the nooses that bound Yaugandharāyaṇa. Bharatarohaka taunts Yaugandharāyaṇa with having had recourse to deceit, but Yaugandharāyaṇa replies that he paid him in the same coin. Then Bharatarohaka states that it was not proper for Vatsarāja to steal away his disciple; but Yaugandharāyaṇa replies that it was nothing less than a marriage between the two. To Bharatarohaka's remark that Vatsarāja's action when Pradyota freed him from the prison was not commendable, Yaugandharāyaṇa's retort is that his master could easily have captured even Pradyota; but he magnanimously let him off. Bharatarohaka asks Yaugandharāyaṇa what his plans were about returning to Kauśāmbī after thus insulting Mahāsena. Yaugandharāyaṇa laughs at the question, stating that in view of the accomplishment of a major work of cutting down the whole tree, lopping the branches was a very minor affair. Just then a chamberlain enters and brings the present of a gold chalice from Mahāsena to Yaugandharāyaṇa, who is at a loss to appreciate the gift, as the honour done to a guilty person in reality pains him as death. Some noise is heard behind the curtain which proves out to be due to the joy expressed by the whole harem at the assurance given by Mahāsena to his queen, who was going to end her life in grief, that the marriage was acceptable to him and that he had decided to perform the marriage ceremony of the effigies of the lovers. Yaugandharāyaṇa is thus convinced of the *bona fides* of the gift and accepts it. The usual prayer in the epilogue for the prosperity of the cows, the vanquishing of the foreign invasion and the ruling of the whole earth by Rājasiṁha terminates the play. (Act IV).

Deviations. As already stated, no definite source for Bhāsa's Udayana legend has been found. In view of the time assigned by us to Bhāsa, neither the *Bṛhatkathā* nor any of the Buddhist and Jain records of Udayana could have served as the original for Bhāsa. Though in their original oral forms, the Buddhist and Jain accounts may have conformed to the actual historical

incidents, the written records (which are not earlier than the third and twelfth century A. D. respectively) contain the legend in the most perverted versions. Such, for instance, are the stories about the teaching of the science of taming elephants through a curtain by a so-called leper to a lame maiden. There is a difference of opinion among competent scholars as to whether Pradyota was the king of Avantī or of Magadha, and whether Pradyota and Mahāsena were the names of the same person, owing to contradictory statements in the various accounts of the legend.[1] It may, however, be mentioned that Bhāsa alone speaks of the identity of the two. Bhāsa differs in the genealogy of Udayana, makes Udayana quite indifferent in the beginning with regard to his marriage with Vāsavadattā, and uses a real elephant as a ruse instead of the mechanical elephant containing soldiers in its body. Minor changes introduced for dramatic effect, such as the madman's apparel, the meeting of the two rival ministers, the proposal to celebrate the marriage of the pictures of the two lovers, etc., are Bhāsa's own creations. We hold that for his Udayana dramas, Bhāsa employs the floating mass of tradition handed down orally in his time. Though the generally accepted dates of Udayana, Pradyota, etc. make them contemporaneous with Buddha, Dr. S. V. Ketkar places the former a couple of centuries before Buddha's death.[2] In any case, Bhāsa is not far removed in time from the central figures in the Udayana legend, and we may safely conclude that he bases his dramas on the oral accounts.

Type of drama. As already stated, Dr. Winternitz mentions the *Pratijñā* as 'belonging to the *Prakaraṇa* type', and Dr. Keith also casts his vote in favour of *Prakaraṇa*, as according to him, the *Pratijñā* is styled in the prologue as a *Prakaraṇa* and it resembles in part that form of drama.[3] But the word *Prakaraṇa* used in the prologue simply means 'dramatic composition' in a generic sense (प्रकरणं कथासन्दर्भविशेषम्); and further, " not a single essential

1 Cf. *Prachin Maharastra*, pp. 140-142, and the various references given therein. 2 *Prachin Maharastra*, pp. 132, 142-148. It should be noted in this connection that all Brahmanical, Buddhist, and Jain traditions unanimously proclaim the contemporaneity of Pradyota, Buddha, Bimbisāra, and Udayana. Even the recently discovered *Ārya Mañjuśrī Mūlakalpa* in its Tibetan and Sanskrit versions as given in Dr. Jayaswal's *Imperial History of India* (Lahore, 1934) confirms the tradition. 3 *Problems*, p. 113 ; *SD*, p. 102.

condition of *Prakaraṇa* is fulfilled by the *Pratijñā*."[1] Dr. Ganapati Sastri names the *Pratijñā* as a *Nāṭikā*, taking it to mean "अल्पं नाटकं नाटिका".[2] *Naṭikā*, however, is thus defined in the *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, VI. 269-272:

नाटिका वस्तुवृत्ता स्यात्स्त्रीप्राया चतुरङ्किका ।
प्रख्यातो धीरललितस्तत्र स्यान्नायको नृपः ॥
स्यादन्तःपुरसम्बद्धा सङ्गीतव्याप्रृताथवा ।
नवानुरागा कन्यात्र नायिका नृपवंशजा ॥
सम्यक्वर्तेत नेतास्यां देव्याख्यासेन शङ्कितः ।
देवी पुनर्भवेज्ज्येष्ठा प्रगल्भा नृपवंशजा ॥
पदे पदे मानवती तद्वृत्तः सङ्गमो द्वयोः ।
वृत्तिः स्यात्कैशिकी स्वल्पविमर्शाः सन्धयः पुनः ॥

Though the drama is named after Yaugandharāyaṇa, Vatsarāja is the hero, and Vāsavadattā the heroine; these two, as also the plot, conform to the requirements of a *Nāṭikā*. But in the *Pratijñā* the *vṛtti* is not *kaiśikī*, and there are five *sandhis*; the *Pratijñā* is not स्त्रीप्राया, with a देव्याख्यासेन शंकितः नेता; and again the jealousies of co-wives, secret meetings, etc. are not to be met with.

Dr. Banerji Sastri would term the *Pratijñā* as *Īhāmṛga*,[3] which the *Daśarūpa* (III. 72-75) defines as:

मिश्रमीहामृगे वृत्तं चतुरङ्कं त्रिसन्धिमत् ॥
नरदिव्यावनियमान्नायकप्रतिनायकौ ।
ख्यातौ धीरोद्धतावन्त्यो विपर्यासादयुक्तकृत् ॥
दिव्यस्त्रियमनिच्छन्तीमपहारादिनेच्छतः ।
शृङ्गाराभासमप्यस्य किञ्चित्किञ्चित्प्रदर्शयेत् ॥
संरम्भं परमानीय युद्धं व्याजाच्चिवारयेत् ।
वधप्राप्तस्य कुर्वीत वधं नैव महात्मनः ॥

Now all the above factors are not found in the *Pratijñā*; *e. g.*, the play does not mainly deal with the hard pursuit (ईहा) of the hero after a maiden as unattainable as a gazelle (मृग); further, the woman is to be obtained against her will.[4] As a matter of fact, love or *Śṛṅgāra* which ought to be prominent in a *Nāṭikā* or an *Īhāmṛga* occupies only a secondary position and is incidentally

1 Mankad, *Types of Sanskrit Drama*, pp. 48–55 on p. 55. 2 *Pratijñā*, second edition, p. 9, commentary. 3 *JBORS*, 9, p. 68. For ready reference, the definition of *Īhāmṛga* is given here again, though it appears in the last chapter. 4 It may, however, be noted that the *Pratijñā* admirably answers the last line in the definition of an *Īhāmṛga* in that Vatsarāja and Yaugandharāyaṇa though prisoners of war are not killed.

referred to in the *Pratijñā*. The *Kāvyānuśāsana* (p. 322) allows only one act for an *Īhāmṛga*. Strictly speaking, as we have already stated, the names of the different types of *rūpakas* and *uparūpakas* and their definitions are post-Bhāsa in time. It may be, as suggested by Prof. Dhruva, that in Bhāsa's time all the dramatic compositions were known by the generic name "*Nāṭaka*" irrespective of the number of acts, etc.[1] It has been suggested that the *Svapna* and the *Pratijñā* constitute only one play and belong to the *Prakaraṇa* type. Assuming the works to be one inseparable whole, it cannot be classed under a *Prakaraṇa*, as the plot is not of the poet's creation being well known in his time.[2]

Sentiments etc. The main sentiment is the heroic (*Vīra*) which Dr. Ganapati Sastri specially mentions as *Bhedavīra* and *Yuddhavīra*, interspersed with other secondary sentiments.[3] Thus there are the *Adbhuta* and *Raudra rasas* in the first act, *Hāsya* in the third and fourth acts. By Yaugandharāyaṇa's supporting the love affair of his master there is seen a harmonious blending of the *Vīra* and *Śṛṅgāra rasas*.

The drama abounds in various figures, and only a few striking illustrations are given below :

A beautiful *Arthāntaranyāsa* pronounces the big army of Pradyota lacking in devotion and fixity of purpose to be no better than an undevoted wife (I. 4) :

> स्यक्तं बलं बहु च तस्य न चैककार्यं
> संख्यातवीरपुरुषं च न चानुरक्तम् ।
> स्याज्ञे ततः समभिनन्दति युद्धकाले
> सर्वं हि सैन्यमनुरागमृते कलत्रम् ॥

The idea that the earth, if it be well protected and free from any breaches of the *varṇāśramadharma*, protects her own master, if the latter be in danger, is finely expressed by *Aprastutaprāśaṁsā* based on *Kāvyaliṅga* and *Parikara* (I. 9) :

---

1 *Madhyama*, Abm., 1921, Intr., pp. 21-28 ; *Svapnani Sundari*, 1921, Intr., p. 20. 2 The definition of a *Prakaraṇa* requires its plot to be imaginary (कविकल्पित) and again there should be no Udātta hero, who should be a Brāhmaṇa, a minister, etc. Cf. the definition of the *Prakaraṇa* given elsewhere in this chapter under "*Cārudatta*, (d) Type of Drama,;" Cf. also Keith, *HSL*, Intr., p. XV. 3 *Pratijñā*, second edition, p. 128.

परचक्रैरनाक्रान्ता धर्मसङ्करवर्जिता ।
भूमिर्भर्तारमासाद्य रक्षिता परिरक्षति ॥

The two vows pronounced by Yaugandharāyaṇa are respectively instances of *Rūpaka* (I. 16) and *Upamā* (III. 8):

यदि शत्रुबलग्रस्तो राहुणा चन्द्रमा इव ।
मोचयामि न राजानं नास्मि यौगन्धरायणः ॥ १. १६ ॥
सुभद्रामिव गाण्डीवी नागः पद्मलतामिव ।
यदि तां न हरेद्राजा नास्मि यौगन्धरायणः ॥ ३. ८ ॥

This fusion of *Arthāntaranyāsa* and *Aprastutaprasaṁsā* glorifies the dignity and efficacy of hard labour, emphatically stating that nothing is impossible for an energetic person starting on right lines (I. 18):

काष्ठादग्निर्जायते मथ्यमानाद्
भूमिस्तोयं खन्यमाना ददाति ।
सोत्साहानां नास्त्यसाध्यं नराणां
मार्गारब्धाः सर्वयत्नाः फलन्ति ॥

Contrast with this the achievements of Mahāsena in vanquishing many kings, which fail to satisfy him as he is unable to win over Vatsarāja,—expressed by the blending of *Kāvyaliṅga* and *Paryāyokta* (II. 3):

मम हयखुरभिन्नं मार्गरेणुं नरेन्द्रा
मुकुटतटविलग्नं भृत्यभूता वहन्ति ।
न च मम परितोषो यद्ध मां वत्सराजः
प्रणमति गुणशाली कुञ्जरज्ञानदक्षः ॥

The essential qualities in a prospective son-in-law are enumerated by resorting to *Aprastutaprasaṁsā* (II. 4). The oscillating mental condition of mothers at the prospect of their daughter's marriage, swinging between shame and sorrow, finds its expression in II. 7, illustrating *Kāvyaliṅga* and *Aprastutaprasaṁsā*. These two verses have been quoted in extenso above, while giving the plot of the *Pratijñā*. Other instances are:—*Anumāna* (II. 1, 9; IV. 10, 11); *Sāra* (II. 11); *Paryāya* (I. 8, 14; II. 14; IV. 9, 22); *Kāvyaliṅga* (I. 15; III. 3, 7); *Dṛṣṭānta* (I. 12; IV. 12, 20, 21); *Viṣama* (III. 4; IV. 6, 23).

Critical Study. The plot of the *Pratijñā* has been

adversely criticized by some writers. We have already referred to Bhāmaha's charge and have proved that it does not apply to the *Pratijñā*.[1] Some anti-Bhāsaites even go to the length of stating that the author of the *Pratijñā* improved on the plot in the light of Bhāmaha's criticism, indicating thereby that the *Pratijñā* is subsequent to the seventh century, later than Kālidāsa in any case, and hence can, under no circumstances, be ascribed to the pre-Kālidāsan Bhāsa.[2] Now, the fact that Kauṭilya (4th century B. C.) and Aśvaghoṣa (first century A. D.) are indebted to the *Pratijñā*, coupled with the existence of the *Svapna*, which all ascribe to the author of the *Pratijñā*, definitely before Bhāmaha's date, directly counters all such assumptions.[3] Dr. Keith pronounces the plot construction of the *Svapna* and the *Pratijñā* as 'clumsy' and 'open to criticism' but does not illustrate the point from the *Pratijñā*.[4] Dr. Woolner doubts the genuineness of the second act, and Dr. Johnston dismisses it as a later interpolation.[5] But the act betrays the same skilful and delicate handling as is associated with Bhāsa, and is necessary in order to present before us the true picture of Mahāsena and his plans. Further, "Acts III and IV form a harmonious whole with Act II and give a logical development of the course of events in continuation of Act II."[6] To Dr. Woolner, "it is not quite clear what is supposed to have happened between Act II and Act III or between Act II and Act IV";[7] but it can safely be assumed that Udayana was convalescing under the treatment of Mahāsena, and Yaugandharāyaṇa in disguise had reached Ujjain with his assistants, had succeeded in having secret communications with his master, and was planning means for his escape in the interval between Act II and Act III. The infuriation and taming of Nalāgirī followed by Vatsarāja's freedom from prison and his engaging in music lessons are the intervening events between Acts III and IV.[8]

The *Pratijñā* "is an essentially manly drama,"[9]

---

1 Cf. ante, pp. 72-73. 2 Cf. Kuppuswami Sastri, *Āścarya*, Intr., pp. 21-22. 3 Cf. ante pp. 75, 77; the *Svapna* attested to at least before the 7th century A. D. Cf. Thomas, *JRAS*, 1928, pp. 877-880. 4 *SD*, p. 113. 5 *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Volume 1, p. 4; Johnston, *Lt*, 62, p. 97. 6 Sarup, *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Volume 1, p. 4 note. 7 Op. cit, p. 4. 8 Cf. G. Sastri, *Pratijñā*, second edition, pp. 67-68; 102-103. 9 Meerwarth, *JASB*, 13, p. 267.

there being only two female characters. This drama brings out the poet's power of narrating incidents outside the action of the drama very vividly and impressively, so as to conjure, as it were, a realistic picture before the audience. The graphic narration of the capture of Vatsarāja in the first act is an instance in point. Ibsen, Oscar Wilde, John Galsworthy, among the modern play-wrights, are found to employ dialogues effectively for this purpose. The scene between Yaugandharāyaṇa and Sālaka in the first act reminds one of the scene in *Hamlet* (Act II, Scene I) between Polonius and Renaldo. The domestic atmosphere in the second act is pleasantly realistic. The first part of the third act is at once humorous and suggestive. The humour is at times rendered crude and heavy by the suggestion involved and by the inconsistency in the meaning of the same words used at different places.[1] On the whole, however, the scene is full of fun and transparently suggestive. The last act opens with a humorous scene depicting the toddy shop with Bacchic songs. Everywhere there is rapid action. One naturally expects to see Vatsarāja and Vāsavadattā on the stage after hearing so much about them; but the poet has wonderfully kept them off the stage without detriment to the interest of the play, thus achieving, as it were, the staging of *Hamlet* without the Prince of Denmark. Another speciality of this play is the fact that both the rival parties are satisfied. These two features are to be met with nowhere else in the dramatic literature.

The *Pratijñā* illustrates Bhāsa's trait of investing his characters with the quality of knowing what passes in another's mind by a mere glance: (cf. वक्तुकाममिव त्वां लक्षये। *Pratijñā*, p. 25; *Abh*, p. 50)[2]. Great persons are shown to possess quite a distinct and resonant voice, at once pronouncing them to be above the ordinary run of human beings. Cf. अहो सरस्स गम्भीरदा (p. 69) etc.

The expression अहो हास्यमभिधानम् (which is also found in the *Pañc*, p. 108, and *Dgh*, p. 66) is used in reply to statements which the speaker takes to be ridiculous,—cf. *Pratijñā*, pp. 67, 71.

---

1 *e. g.* मोदकमडक means वत्सराज (*Pratijñā*, second edition, p. 68), यौगन्धरायण (ib. p. 68), capture (ib. p. 91), conference (ib. p. 72), वत्सराजहरण (ib. p. 73), conference time (ib. p. 74) etc. Cf. also Hariyappa, *QJMS*, 23, pp. 238-240. 2 Cf. also *Pratimā*, pp. 13-95 : Avi. p. 1 ; *Abh*, p. 40 : Supra p. 8.

The following is one of the few popular songs in eulogy of drink met with in this play alone ; possibly these were the remnants of the drinking songs in ancient India (IV. 1, 2, pp. 57-58) :

भग्गा सुराहि मत्ता भग्गा सुराहि अणुलित्ता ।
भग्गा सुराहि ह्लादा भग्गा सुराहि संवविदा ॥

We shall consider the relationship of Bhāsa's Udayana plays with other dramas on the subject by different dramatists towards the close of our critical study of the *Svapna* ; we have sufficiently referred to the alleged alternative title '*Vatsarājacarita*' by which some scribes designate the *Pratijñā*.[1] Great capital has been made of the popularity of the third act of the *Pratijñā*, known as *Mantrāṅka*, on the Kerala stage and the fact is taken as the evidence of the Kerala origin of the group. The portion in the printed text corresponds with the actors' versions and fits in well with the other acts of the play. So it is clear that the *Mantrāṅka* forms an integral part of the *Pratijñā* and is not a distinct stage version prepared by the actors. The popularity of any drama on the Kerala stage cannot be taken to postulate its Kerala origin.

SVAPNAVĀSAVADATTA.

Title. The play receives its name from the vision *(svapna)* of *Vāsavadattā* which king Udayana gets in his semi-drowsy state described in the fifth act (Dream scene). स्वप्ननाटकं, स्वप्नवासवदत्ता and स्वप्नवासवदत्तम् are the titles of one and the same play. They are to be explained respectively as स्वप्नप्रधानं नाटकं; स्वप्नदृष्टा वासवदत्ता स्वप्नवासवदत्ता, तत्प्रतिपादके तच्छब्दोपचारः ; and स्वप्नदृष्टा वासवदत्ता अत्र according to Dr. Ganapati Sastri.[2] Prof. Ray, however, prefers to take the title to mean 'the drama, the subject matter of which is the dream and Vāsavadattā' (स्वप्नश्च वासवदत्ता च स्वप्नवासवदत्तम्) as "it emphasizes both the incidents referred to in the title."[3]

---

1 To recapitulate: *Vatsarājacarita* is said to be the composition of Śūdraka, and on account of the alternative title, the *Pratijñā* has been ascribed to Śūdraka (Raja, *JOR*, 1, p. 243 ; Sankar, *AMV*, 2, p. 60). But the fact that Abhinavagupta styles *Ratnāvalī* as *Vatsarājacarita* (*Dhvanyālokalocana*, Kāvyamālā, XXV, p. 162) goes against this assumption, as also the announcement of the proposed publication of the *Vatsarājacarita* in the Dakṣina Bhārati Series (Kavi, *JAIHRS*, 2, p. 143). It is not clear, if the *Pratijñā* be really the *Vatsarājacarita* of Śūdraka, why there is no reference to the name of the author and the work in the prologue. 2 *Svapna*, 1924 edition, p. 8. 3 *Svapna*, Intr., p. XLVIII.

Plot. The *Svapna* forms a sequel to the events described in the *Pratijñā*. After reaching his kingdom along with Vāsavadattā, king Udayana began to enjoy life and neglected his state affairs which enabled his enemies to march against him. One Āruṇi had invaded the Vatsa kingdom and had conquered a portion of it. The ever watchful Yaugandharāyaṇa saw that political alliance with the powerful Magadha king by way of marriage was the only effective remedy to set matters right and drive out Āruṇi. But the king was excessively attached to Vāsavadattā, who also would not have liked to get her husband married to another woman; the Magadha king, further, would not have consented to the marriage of his sister with a married person. So Yaugandharāyaṇa hits upon a plot and takes Vāsavadattā in his confidence and she agrees solely for the sake of the good of her husband. The plan was to send the king away to Lāvāṇaka with his retinue on the frontiers of his kingdom for hunting, and, in his absence, to burn the royal pavilion. Yaugandharāyaṇa and Vāsavadattā were to get away secretly from the pavilion and the king was to be told of the death of the two in the fire. Yaugandharāyaṇa and Vāsavadattā then left the Vatsa kingdom in the guise of a Brahmin and his sister and started for Rājagṛha, the capital of the Magadha kingdom. The play opens with Vāsavadattā and Yaugandharāyaṇa in disguise nearing the Āśrama outside Rājagṛha.

When, after the benedictory stanza introducing the names of some of the principal *dramatis personæ*, the stage-manager is about to make his speech, he is disturbed by some noise behind the curtains. Apparently the attendants of Princess Padmāvatī who is on her way to the penance-grove, are asking the public to make way. After the exit of the stage-manager, enter Yaugandharāyaṇa and Vāsavadattā, dressed as a mendicant and his sister respectively. To Yaugandharāyaṇa it appears quite strange that people are driven away even from the holy hermitage. Vāsavadattā feels pained at the insult, but Yaugandharāyaṇa consoles her. The chamberlain, however, orders the guard not to drive the people away. On enquiries, Yaugandharāyaṇa comes to know from the chamberlain that Princess Padmāvatī

is to visit the hermitage to honour the queen-mother, and she is to stay there for a night. Then Padmāvatī approaches with her retinue, and Vāsavadattā at once feels a liking for her. Padmāvatī salutes the lady-hermit (queen-mother). From Padmāvatī's maid, it is learnt that king Pradyota had sent an envoy for the hand of the princess for his son. Padmāvatī then proclaims her desire, through her chamberlain, of fulfilling the wants of those asking for boons. The inmates of the hermitage being all satisfied, none came forward. Yaugandharāyaṇa, however, presents himself as a suppliant *(arthi)* and expresses his wish to keep his sister (*viz.*, Vāsavadattā) under the care of the princess for a time, till the former's husband returns. Despite the protest of her chamberlain stating the difficulty involved in keeping watch over the ward, princess Padmāvatī decides to keep her word and accepts the guardianship of the Brahmin lady (Vāsavadattā in disguise) whom Padmāvatī and her retinue take to be born of a high family. A Brahmin student from Lāvāṇaka approaches the hermitage but is taken aback on seeing ladies there. The chamberlain assures him and offers him refreshments. From the student all there come to know of the disastrous fire at Lāvāṇaka and the reported death of Yaugandharāyaṇa and Vāsavadattā therein, of the immense grief of the king after his return from hunting, and of the minister's preventing him from ending his life in the fire. The ministers, continues the student, then forcibly took the king away from Lāvāṇaka as his life was in danger owing to his sorrow, lamentations, neglect of his body, etc. The king's extraordinary affection for Vāsavadattā appeals to all, and in the question of the maid, whether the king would again marry, Padmāvatī feels expressed her own heart. The student then leaves as it was becoming dark and Yaugandharāyaṇa follows suit, after bidding adieu to Padmāvatī and his sister. The chamberlain then announces it to be time for retiring within, and the curtain falls after the princess and Vāsavadattā have saluted the lady-hermit and received suitable blessings. (Act I).

The interlude to the next act informs us that Vāsavadattā is well established in the new household and that princess Padmāvatī is enjoying the game of ball with her maids and Vāsavadattā. The main scene opens

with Padmāvatī exhausted after a strenuous game surrounded by her maids and Vāsavadattā. Vāsavadattā jocularly refers to her red hands as being due to *rāga* (red colour or love). Then by various questions, she tries to explore Padmāvatī's mind and learns that the latter is not well disposed towards Mahāsena's son and has a regard for Udayana owing to his genuine love for Vāsavadattā. This is a disconcerting news for Vāsavadattā, and unwittingly she refers to the handsome features of Udayana, and explains her knowledge as due to the impression of the residents of Ujjain. Padmāvatī's nurse enters to announce the news of the betrothal of the princess to Udayana. This is yet another shock for Vāsavadattā, who shows her discomfiture by referring to Udayana's indifference and begins to doubt his regard for her ; but the subsequent particulars supplied by the nurse dispel all misgivings. She tells that Udayana had not himself asked for the hand of Padmāvatī, but had yielded to pressure from Darśaka. Another maid from the queen informs Padmāvatī that the queen had sent for her as the *Kautukamaṅgalavidhi* (the ceremony of tying the nuptial thread) was to be celebrated that very day. Vāsavadattā is again stunned, but has to accompany Padmāvatī and her maids when they all leave to approach the queen. "The more they hasten", says she, "the more is my heart covered as it were with darkness." (Act II).

The next act opens in the pleasure-garden of Padmāvatī the same day. Vāsavadattā is the lonely occupant there, who has come to ease her grieved heart when all the royal household was engaged in preparations for the marriage. The thought that her husband is to become another's is the poisoned arrow in her heart. A maid approaches Vāsavadattā with flowers, and requests her on behalf of the queen to plait the nuptial wreath for Padmāvatī's wedding as she (Vāsavadattā) was 'of a noble family, affectionate, and clever'. The maid relates her impressions of the bridegroom that he is Cupid incarnate without his bow and arrows. Then Vāsavadattā sorrowfully begins her work, employing profusely the herbs called *avidhavākaraṇa* but excludes *sapatnīmardana* (oppresser of co-wives) as it was unnecessary, she says, since Padmāvatī's co-wife was no

more. Another maid enters to ask to hasten the wreathing as the bridegroom was being conducted to the inner court-room. Vāsavadattā hands over the finished garland and the two maids go away. Vāsavadattā also leaves the stage full of sorrow to find solace in her bed, if perchance she could get sleep and forget her grief. (Act III).

The action of the next act begins a few days after the marriage of Udayana and Padmāvatī. The interlude opens with the soliloquy of the gluttonous Vidūṣaka who informs of the successful termination of the marriage festivities, of the joyous life he is leading at the Magadha palace and of the indigestion due to excessive eating and consequent sleeplessness. A maid enters to inquire whether the royal bridegroom had finished his bath, as flowers and ointments were to be brought for him after his bath. They both then leave the stage, Vidūṣaka to attend on the king, but only after telling the maid to bring everything but food, as his bowels were playing him false. The main scene opens with the entrance of Padmāvatī, her retinue, and Vāsavadattā (in the guise of Āvantikā) in the pleasure-garden to witness whether the *śephālikā* clusters have blossomed. They find the plants and creepers in full bloom and after collecting flowers, sit down on a stone-slab and engage in some pleasant chat. After a time their talk turns to Udayana, and Padmāvatī artlessly tells Vāsavadattā that she was much devoted to Udayana and felt wretched in his absence. In course of conversation, Padmāvatī says she doubts whether Vāsavadattā had so much regard for her Lord, and Vāsavadattā cannot but reply that she had much more regard. Asked the reason, Vāsavadattā refers to her elopement for the sake of her husband. The maid then asks Padmāvatī to request her husband to be taught to play on the lute. Padmāvatī says she had already spoken to him, but, heaving a deep sigh, he had turned away his face. She had not repeated her request, and her inference from the king's conduct was that his memory of Vāsavadattā was still fresh. Vāsavadattā feels blessed that her husband still cherished her love.

The king and Vidūṣaka enter the pleasure-garden, the former musing over the happy past and pungently

feeling the loss of Vāsavadattā. Vidūṣaka tries to divert his mind from the distressing thoughts by referring to Padmāvatī and to the flock of cranes flying in the sky. The king sees and appreciates the sight, and Padmāvatī, her maids, and Vāsavadattā also observe the cranes appearing like a white garland of *kokanada* flowers. The ladies, however, see the king and retire under a bower nearby for the sake of Vāsavadattā, as she avoided the sight of strangers. Vidūṣaka approaches the stone-slab occupied by Padmāvatī, and from the plucking and gathering of flowers infers that Padmāvatī must have left very recently. They decide to sit down on the stone-seat, but the scorching heat is unbearable, and they propose to enter the bower (which is occupied by the ladies). To prevent their entry the maid shakes the creeper, which lets loose a swarm of bees, rendering impossible the further progress of the king and the jester. They retrace their steps and again occupy their original seats. Vāsavadattā's eyes are full of tears which she explains to be due to the pollens of the *kāśa* flowers falling in her eyes. Vidūṣaka asks the king : " Who is your sweetheart, Vāsavadattā or Padmāvatī ? " The king tries to put him off by saying that the question was very awkward, and that he (*i. e.*, Vidūṣaka) was a chatterbox. But Vidūṣaka forces him to reply, stating that he (*i. e.*, the king) need not be afraid, as, of the two queens, one was dead and the other was away. (In reality, both the ladies are very near, separated only by the bower). The king's reply is worthy of the noble soul that he is ; " No doubt, I have a very high regard for Padmāvatī on account of the sweetness of her figure and temper ; but she has not yet won over my heart which is still captivated by Vāsavadattā ". On hearing this, Vāsavadattā feels amply rewarded for her trouble. To the maid's remark that the king is cruel, Padmāvatī retorts by saying that her Lord is sympathetic and kind as he still dotes on Vāsavadattā. The king, in his turn, coaxes the jester to give out his impressions of the two queens. Vidūṣaka, however, is not to be easily fooled thus and praises both, indicating his slight preference for Padmāvatī as she serves him with delicacies. The king is reminded of Vāsavadattā and his eyes are full of tears. Vāsavadattā is pleased to hear what her Lord says. The jester tries to console the king, but the

latter replies that constant recollections freshen his grief and tears ease the tension. The jester then leaves to bring water for washing the face of his master. Vāsavadattā and the maids make their exit unseen by the king, as his vision was obscured by tears, and Padmāvatī nears her Lord to console him. Vidūṣaka enters with water and hands it over to Padmāvatī saying that the pollens of *kāśa* flowers had fallen into his master's eyes and hence they were streaming with tears. Approaching the king, Vidūṣaka whispers the same into his ears and in order not to pain the young and newly wedded Padmāvatī by stating the truth, the king gives out the same reason for his tears. Vidūṣaka announces it to be time for the visit of the Magadha king and all make their exit. (Act IV).

In the interlude to the next act we are informed that Padmāvatī is suffering from headache and that her bed has been prepared in the 'Sea-Room'. The palace maid tells Vasantaka (the jester) to convey the news to his master, and then goes to render medical aid to Padmāvatī. Udayana is again the same despondent and aggrieved lover constantly doting on Vāsavadattā. On being told of Padmāvatī's illness he at once starts for the Sea-Room to comfort her. Vidūṣaka mistakes a garland for a serpent in the way. They find the Sea-Room without Padmāvatī, and the perfect condition of the bed suggests to the king that Padmāvatī had not occupied the bed; he awaits her arrival on the same bed, and his thoughts again return to Vāsavadattā. To humour him, Vidūṣaka begins to tell a story but its beginning reminds the king of Ujjayinī and Vāsavadattā. Vidūṣaka's next story falls on deaf ears as the sweet memories of the past lull the king to sleep. Finding his royal friend thus, Vidūṣaka goes inside to bring a cloak. The only companion to the king in the lonely room is a flickering lamp.

At this stage Vāsavadattā makes her entrance on the stage to approach the Sea-Room to comfort and humour Padmāvatī on being told of her sudden illness. In the dim light she takes the person sleeping on the bed to be Padmāvatī and, from the perfect breathing of the sleeping person, infers that Padmāvatī was now all right. In order that her conduct may not be taken to be void of

cordiality, Vāsavadattā lies down on the same bed and embraces its occupant. The king, however, calls out her name in sleep, and Vāsavadattā at once realizes her mistake and is afraid lest her Lord should see her. He again speaks in sleep and this convinces her that he was not awake. He asks her to speak something, and unknowingly she replies to him. Then in his sleep he asks her some further questions and she replies to him. Finally, in his sleep, the king proffers his hands to ask forgiveness of Vāsavadattā who thinks of leaving him, lest she be recognized. She, however, keeps in position his hand that was hanging loose from the bedstead and goes away. The touch of her hand slightly revives the king who, at once, follows her saying, "Stop, Vāsavadattā stop." But he strikes against a door and becomes perfectly wide awake. To Vasantaka, who comes just then, the king relates that Vāsavadattā was alive, but the latter disbelieves him and dismisses it all as being a mere dream, an empty nothing. The king tells him all the details, as also the fact of his body being still thrilled and pulsated by her touch, but all this fails to convince Vidūṣaka, and he asks his master to accompany him to the inner quadrangle. News is brought from the chamberlain of king Darśaka that Rumaṇvan, the Commander-in-chief of the Vatsa forces, has come with a large and well-equipped army, and the vast army of the Magadha king also is ready to help him; and that the king has requested Udayana to make preparations for advancing against the rebel Āruṇi. Udayana then leaves to take charge of the attack. (Act V). This is the famous "Dream-Scene" which gives its name to the play.

The interlude to the next act opens after the successful termination of the war with Āruṇi and the regaining of the Vatsa kingdom. To the chamberlain who announces the entry of the nurse of Vāsavadattā and Mahāsena's chamberlain to congratulate Udayana on his recent gains, the door-keeper tells that Udayana is again in sorrow, being reminded of Vāsavadattā by the recovery of his famous lute, Ghoṣavatī. The main scene presents us with the king and Vidūṣaka, the former piteously mourning Vāsavadattā's loss. The king recalls all the blissful memories of the past and addresses

the lute in touching tones. The messengers from Ujjayinī are announced and the king calls Padmāvatī. The royal couple is anxious as to what the message from mighty Mahāsena might be, and Padmāvatī calls Vāsavadattā's people her own. Udayana honours the ambassadors from his father-in-law, and Raibhya, the messenger, offers him the felicitations of Mahāsena on his great victory. Udayana is pleased at the paternal attitude of Mahāsena. The nurse of Vāsavadattā tells that queen Aṅgāravatī has inquired if all was well there, which again grieves Udayana very much, reminding him painfully of his beloved queen and pupil. Both the Ujjayinī people console him. The nurse, further, uncovers the portraits of Udayana and Vāsavadattā sent by queen Aṅgāravatī which were used in celebrating the marriage-ceremony of both after their elopement. The queen has requested Udayana to forget his grief by looking at Vāsavadattā's picture. Padmāvatī wishes to pay homage to Vāsavadattā, has a view of the portrait, and finds that her new friend Āvantikā has features remarkably similar to Vāsavadattā's. She enquires whether the portrait is an exact replica of Vāsavadattā, and Udayana replies that he considers the picture to be Vāsavadattā herself. Padmāvatī observes that Udayana's patrait also displays wonderful likeness and concludes Vāsavadattā's picture to be also similarly executed. Her face shows signs of joy and perplexity. The king asks the reason of her pensive mood and is told about the Brahmin lady with similar features kept as a deposit, and also about her avoiding the company of males. Just then enters the portress to say that the Brahmin from Ujjayinī has come to reclaim his deposit. The Brahmin is asked to be ushered in, and Padmāvatī is sent to bring in Āvantikā. The voice of the Brahmin (Yaugandharāyaṇa in disguise), who pronounces victory to the king, appears to the latter as familiar but not exactly identifiable. After Padmāvatī and Āvantikā enter the stage, the king states that the deposit should be returned in the presence of witnesses and the envoys from Ujjayinī would serve as witnesses. The nurse of Vāsavadattā, however, recognizes her, and thereupon the king asks Āvantikā to go inside to the ladies court. Yaugandharāyaṇa says that it was not proper for a noble scion of the Bharata family to take

another lady by force. The king then desires to see the striking similarity of form, and orders the veil to be drawn. Yaugandharāyaṇa then asks for the pardon of his master for his treason in concealing the queen. Padmāvatī pays her homage to Vāsavadattā. Yaugandharāyaṇa explains his main object in the whole scheme to be "the saving of Kauśāmbī," and also tells that Rumaṇvan and all knew of this. The king then decides to go with Padmāvatī to convey the happy tidings of the recovery of Vāsavadattā to Mahāsena and queen Aṅgāravatī. The normal *Bharatavākya* concludes the play. (Act VI).

Deviations. As already stated, no precise source for the Udayana dramas of Bhāsa is known. Being considerably earlier than the *Bṛhatkathā*, the latter cannot serve as the source for Bhāsa; and, further, judging from the Sanskrit descendants of the *Bṛhatkathā*, there seem to be many differences in the versions of the Udayana legend dealt with by both. Prof. Lacôte and Dr. Keith pronounce the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṁgraha* by Budhasvāmī to be more faithful to the original;[1] but it does not deal at length with the incidents contained in the *Svapna* of Bhāsa. Judging from the story as preserved in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, some of the notable differences are stated below.[2]

Pradyota is stated to be the name of the Magadha king and Padmāvatī is his daughter. Vāsavadattā in disguise is represented as the daughter of Yaugandharāyaṇa, an old Brāhmaṇa and not Parivrājaka, and Vasantaka, the jester, also accompanies her and stays with her in the Magadha capital as her brother, a squint-eyed Brāhmaṇa. The meeting with Padmāvatī takes place in a park and not in the Tapovana. Through Nārada's prediction Udayana is somewhat aware of the impending calamity, which is to be only of temporary duration. There is no reference to the rebellion of Aruṇi nor to the loss of the Vatsa kingdom. Vatsarāja comes over to Rājagṛha specifically for the purpose of marrying with Padmāvatī in response to the invitation from the Magadha king, whereas in the *Svapna* he is represented

---

1 Lacôte, *QJMS*, 11, pp. 287-288; Keith, *HSL*, p. 273. 2 Kathāmukha and Lāvāṇaka Lambakas, from the *Kathāsaritsāgara*.

as having come over to Rājagṛha on some other mission. The meeting and reunion with Vāsavadattā take place at Lāvāṇaka after leaving Magadha, while Bhāsa effects the meeting in the palace of Darśaka. It seems more likely that Bhāsa's story contains the historical events from first-hand knowledge as he is quite near in time to Udayana. Subsequent writers show Udayana as a man of pleasure, indulging in every sort of enjoyment, but Bhāsa's Udayana is an ideal husband.

Type of Drama. The *Svapna* is a *Nāṭaka* with a well-known plot, the hero being a king and *dhiralalita.* There is a bye-plot *(patākā)* of the marriage of Padmāvatī. There are a number of *praveśakas* in this play.

Sentiments etc. The main sentiments are *Śṛṅgāra* and *Karuṇa.* The instances of both—*Sambhoga* and *Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra* are furnished in the hero's relations with reference to Padmāvatī and Vāsavadattā respectively; but the *Śṛṅgāra*, as will be noted hereafter, is of the highest type. Vāsavadattā's predicaments as well as the reminiscences of the king are good instances of *Karuṇa.* This play being the product of the mature genius of our poet, there are found in it various beautiful figures as also a number of combinations of them *(saṁsṛṣṭi)* scattered at many places. Some striking figures are noted below, and a few instances are given:

Svabhāvokti. (I. 12, 13; IV. 2; V. 3, 4); *Arthāntaranyāsa* (I. 11; IV. 6, 10; VI. 7, 14); *Kāvyaliṅga* (I. 5, 7, 9; V. 2, 7); *Smaraṇa* (V. 5); *Apahnuti* (V. 3); *Anujñā* (V. 9); *Viṣama* (IV. 6); *Anumāna* (I. 12; V. 4).

Svabhāvokti and *Virodhābhāsa:*

नैवेदानीं तादृशाश्चक्रवाका
नैवाप्यन्ये स्त्रीविशेषैर्वियुक्ताः।
धन्या सा स्त्री यां तथा वेत्ति भर्ता
भर्तुश्चेहात् सा हि दृश्याप्यदृश्या ॥१.१३॥

Viṣama and *Arthāntaranyāsa:*

दुःखं खलु बद्धमूलोऽनुरागः

Upamā, Viśeṣokti; and *Vibhāvanā:*

श्याममवन्तिनृपतेः सदृशीं तनूजां
कालक्रमेण पुनरागतदारभारः।
लावाणके हुतवहेन हृताङ्गयष्टिं
तां पद्मिनीं हिमहतामिव चिन्तयामि ॥५.१॥

Smaraṇa:

स्मरामयवन्त्याधिपतेः सुतायाः

स्मृत्वा स्मृत्वा याति दुःखं नवरवम् ।
यात्रा लेषा यद् विमुच्येह बाष्पं
प्राप्तानूष्मा याति बुद्धिः प्रसादम् ॥४.६॥

Upamā and *Arthāntaranyāsa :*

पूर्वं त्वयाप्यभिमतं गतमेवमासी-
च्छ्वास्यं गमिष्यसि पुनर्विजयेन भर्तुः ।
कालक्रमेण जगतः परिवर्तमाना
चक्रारपङ्क्तिरिव गच्छति भाग्यपङ्क्तिः ॥१.४॥

Atiśayokti and *Utprekṣā :*

कामेनोज्झितिनीं गते मयि तदा कामप्यवस्थां गते
दृष्ट्वा स्वैरमवन्तिराजतनया पद्मेषवः पातिताः ।
तैरद्यापि सशल्यमेव हृदयं भूयश्च विद्धा वयं
पद्मेषुर्मदनो यदा कथमयं षष्ठः शरः पातितः
॥४.१॥

प्रस्थानकाले स्वजनं स्मरन्त्याः ।
बाष्पं प्रवृत्तं नयनान्तलग्नं
स्नेहान्ममैवोरसि पातयन्त्याः ॥५.५॥

Anumāna :

पादाक्रान्तानि पुष्पाणि सोष्म चेदं शिलातलम् ।
नूनं काचिदिहासीना मां दृष्ट्वा सहसा गता॥४.४॥

Arthāntaranyāsa and *Aprastutaprašaṁsā :*

कातरा येऽप्यशक्ता वा नोत्साहस्तेषु जायते ।
प्रायेण हि नरेन्द्रश्रीः सोत्साहैरेव भुज्यते ॥६.७॥

Critical Study. The Udayana legend has been the fountain-head of much literature—Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jain,—and the *Bṛhatkathāślokasaṁgraha*, the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* and the *Kathāsaritsāgara* are among the Sanskrit works that deal in detail with the history of the Udayana family as it were. There are also a number of Sanskrit dramas on Udayana Vatsarāja, the *Ratnāvalī* and *Priyadarśikā* attributed to Śri Harṣa, the *Unmādavāsavadattā* of Śaktibhadra, the *Tāpasa Vatsarāja* of Anaṅga Harṣa or Māyūrāja, the *Vatsarājacarita* of Śūdraka, being some of them.

The superiority of Bhāsa as a dramatist and a moral teacher having a perfect sense of the 'values,' will at once be apparent when we compare his Udayana plays with those of Śrī Harṣa. The later writer has changed the characters of Udayana and his queens. In the hands of Śrī Harṣa, Udayana appears as a sensual man, a man of pleasure, a man of *patañgavṛtti*, quite different from the constant and devoted husband depicted by Bhāsa. Vāsavadattā is also a jealous and high-minded wife with Harṣa. With all the virtues and good characteristics attributed by Bhāsa to the lovers, they are quite human. It has been suggested that Udayana was in reality a highly lascivious, passionate king, and that Bhāsa has based his play on historical facts distorted

in accordance with political exigencies.[1] Judging from the other works of Bhāsa and in view of the date that we have assigned to him, we think that Bhāsa represents the true state of affairs. Reference to Aruṇi, which is not found in any of the descendants of the *Bṛhatkathā* which professes to tell the history of Udayana, also confirms our view that Bhāsa has quite a distinct source for his story, which, most probably, was the floating tradition in his day, he being proximate in time to Udayana.

No one would now seriously maintain that the title of the *Svapna* published in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series is not "Svapnavāsavadatta," that the two are distinct works; and that there are two Bhāsas as the authors of those two works. The question has been considered at some length earlier in this book.[2] It is certainly more reasonable and rational to assume the existence of *different recensions* of the *Svapna*; but, as has recently been observed by Dr. Sukthankar, "the discussion has now unfortunately reached the stage of dogmatic controversy and it is extremely unlikely that even the most patent proofs adduced to prove the authenticity of our *Svapnavāsavadatta* will induce the 'anti-Bhāsaites' to revise their opinion and to reorient their ideas which have now crystallized once for all".[3]

The *Svapna* has everywhere been acclaimed as 'a dramatic masterpiece', a 'profound psychological study.' It is "the glorious heritage of the whole civilized world".[4] The *Svapna* depicts the struggle in the soul of Vāsavadattā who is a loving, self-sacrificing wife,—the Indian ideal of a chaste, devoted wife. Padmāvatī is a fitting co-wife to her and Udayana also a deserving husband. Dr. Johnston finds the *Svapna* to be unique in the whole range of Sanskrit drama in that it "treats the display of a single character under the search-light of the theatre as the real problem for solution," and its author is "the first Sanskrit author to whom the exact preservation of 'values'....is the essential of good drama and good writing".[5] The last scene in the *Svapna*, in which

---

1 Cf. Ketkar, *Prachin Maharastra*, pp. 138-139. 2 Supra, pp. 23-24. 3 While reviewing the *Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa*, edited by M. Dillon, Oxford University Press, 1937, in the *Oriental Literary Digest*, December 1937, p. 1. 4 Sukthankar, Foreword to Urdhvareshe's Marathi translation, p. 3. 5 *Lt.*, 62, pp. 96-97.

Vāsavadattā appears on the stage, where her nurse and Padmāvatī see her but not the king, is said to show defective technique, and Dr. Johnston overrules the objection as 'without substance' on the ground of Vāsavadattā's conception of proper behaviour, stating further that "the exact nature of the arrangement by which she was screened from the king's view escapes our knowledge now".[1] Despite the objectors' views to the contrary, we think that a transverse curtain satisfactorily explains the situation; and there is no positive evidence to support the view that transverse curtains were unknown to the Indian stage. Dr. Barnett pronounces Udayana to be "a flabby sensualist who has been unfaithful to Vāsavadattā in the old days and after her supposed death allows himself for political reasons to be affianced to another lady for whom he cares little or nothing, while he sheds at intervals maudlin tears over his first love".[2] All this cannot be applied to Udayana as depicted by Bhāsa. The only reference to his being unfaithful may be found in a defective reading of the text किं विरचितां स्मरसि। (Act V, p. 110). Bhāsa is certainly not referring to the lady of the harem.[3] And again, his sorrow for the loss of Vāsavadattā is quite genuine and touching, and, in fact, is one of the main reasons why a flame of love was kindled in Padmāvatī's heart, and he certainly cares for Padmāvatī.[4] Dr. Barnett's objections may well be directed against Udayana as portrayed in the *Bṛhatkathā* versions. The Hindu readers will at once realize and appreciate the sterling worth of Padmāvatī's character, which is rather difficult for the Western critics to understand. In fact, Bhāsa intends to place before the spectators the ideals

---

1 Keith, *SD*, p. 113; Woolner and Sarup, *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Vol. I, p. 69 n1; Johnston, *IA*, 62, p. 96. 2 *BSOS*, 3, p. 379. 3 Most of the texts give the reading as विरचिकां and bring in the mistress of Udayana of that name on the strength of the *Kathāsaritsāgara* (II. 6. 65-66). But this is absolutely unsound in view of the characteristics assigned by Bhāsa to Udayana in contrast to those associated with him by the *Bṛhatkathā* and its descendants. Bhāsa's Udayana is a noble and true husband sincerely devoted to Vāsavadattā and there is no reference to his love-affairs in Bhāsa's Udayana dramas. The text at the particular point appears to be corrupt; it may be translated as "Are you put in mind of the decoration that I used to do (formerly)?" 4 Cf. the description of Udayana's sorrow for the loss of Vāsavadattā given by the Brahmacāri (pp. 28-34); also his love and grief for her (II. 1. 5, 7; V. 1. 5; pp. 108, 120-121; VI. 1. 2, 3). साणुक्कोसो त्ति p. 44. is the reason why Padmāvatī was attracted to him. That he cares for Padmāvatī will be evident from p. 68—तक्केमि अय्याए वासवदत्ताए गुणाणि सुमरिअ दक्खिण्णाए मम अम्मओ ण रोदिदि त्ति। also II. 5. 9; p. 94; V. 2.

of polygamous marriages which were common in those days. Taking things as they are, is not Padmāvatī's character true to life and fit to be copied by the junior consorts ? She accepts the senior queen as her elder sister, and to an Indian wife the carrying out of the wishes of her Lord cheerfully constitutes the sole Dharma, assuming of course the husband to be well grounded in moral and religious duties.

This drama exhibits the poet's powers of narration through dialogues, the student's graphic description of the incidents after Vāsavadattā's reported loss being an instance in point. There are two acts in this play without a single verse. There is no waste of energy in describing events. Everything is clear in a flash. Action is the main thing in the *Svapna*, and the poet has given no time for the love to grow between the newly wedded couple. There are a number of beautiful scenes in this play, but two of them stand quite apart being unparalleled in Sanskrit drama. The scene in the Pramada Vana under the *śephālikā* bower minutely portrays the sentiments of Udayana, Padmāvatī and Vāsavadattā, the king being unaware of the presence of the two ladies, and Padmāvatī being in the dark as to the identity of Vāsavadattā ;[1] it brings forth the inner workings of the minds of the three in their true light. The whole scene is full of dramatic force and tension. It presents us with the ideals of polygamy. The struggle in Udayana's mind between his old love for Vāsavadattā and his new love for Padmāvatī is beautifully expressed. The scene is comparable to the third scene in the fourth act of Sheridan's '*School for Scandal*', which is called the Screen-Scene.

The dream-scene in the fifth act from which the drama receives its name and in which the vague belief of the king that Vāsavadattā is alive is turned into conviction by the dream and the touch of her hand is very delicately executed. The scene reminds one of a similar one in the *Winter's Tale* (Act V, Scene 3) where Leontes faces the statue of Hermione.

As the drama mainly deals with the feelings of Vāsavadattā, an ideal woman under cruel circumstances,

1 *Svapna*, Act IV, pp. 77-85.

reference may also be made to Acts II and III. On the occasion of Padmāvatī's marriage when Vāsavadattā must not weep though she cannot help it, she has no sympathizer to share in her sorrow and lessen it; and again it falls to her lot to wreathe the garlands for her co-wife.[1] None but a master artist could draw these scenes with such supreme delicacy and skill. These acts are comparatively very short and one is tempted to infer that some condensation has been made subsequently and that the text is not well preserved. The poet has really shown his talent, judgment, sense of proportion and knowledge of human psychology and of the stage, in separating these two scenes into different acts though the later follows the earlier one quickly in time.

The *Svapna*, as said by Mr. Meerwarth, is 'essentially feminine' as compared with the *Pratijñā*, which is 'an essentially manly drama'.[2] As observed earlier, Bhāsa aims at direct uninterrupted action, not at plot construction or characterization. Everything is subordinated to action. In the *Pratijñā* the action is external, whereas in the *Svapna* it is mainly psychological. With regard to characterization the poet seems to have concentrated his attention on portraying Vāsavadattā; the other characters, though well drawn, serve only as a sort of background, emphasizing some facet of her character. Padmāvatī, the lovely, kind and merry maiden, serves as a sharp contrast to the sad and suffering Vāsavadattā of mature years.

No reference is found except in the *Svapna* to the rebel Āruṇi who is said to have usurped the Vatsa kingdom and was subsequently vanquished by Udayana with the aid of the Magadha king. Harṣa probably copied the name from Bhāsa. Nothing is practically known about this Āruṇi, and Mr. Soman hazards a guess as to Āruṇi's being a forest king or a Persian.[3] Mr. Deb also indicates Persian menace to the Vatsa kingdom.[4] Dr. Bhandarkar, on the other hand, presumes him to have been a king of Kosala.[5]

The word '*vismita*' in the sense of 'proud' appears

---

1 *Svapna*, pp. 49, 51-56. 2 *JASB*, 13, p. 267. 3 Bhāsa's works, Marathi translation, Intr., pp. 223-225. 4 *JASB*, 1933, p. 340. 5 *Carm. Lect.*, 1918, p. 62.

in the *Svapna* (I. 3 ; VI. 4) in common with the *Pañc* (p. 28) and the *Dv* (p. 12).

Vatsarāja utters the profound truth of the rareness of gratitude :

गुणानां वा विशालानां सत्काराणां च निह्नवः ।
कर्तारः सुलभा लोके विज्ञातारस्तु दुर्लभाः ॥४.१०॥

The following description of the Tapovana reminds one of a similar verse in the *Śākuntala* :

विस्रब्धं हरिणाश्चरन्त्यचकिता देशागतप्रत्यया
वृक्षाः पुष्पफलैः समृद्धविटपाः सर्वे दयारक्षिताः ।
भूयिष्ठं कपिलानि गोकुलधनान्यक्षेत्रवन्ध्यो दिशो
निःसन्दिग्धमिदं तपोवनमयं धूमो हि वह्न्याश्रयः ॥१.१२॥

The lute reminds the king of its constant companion, the queen, and he breaks out into the following utterance, the verse touching a very pathetic note :

श्रुतिसुखनिनदे ! कथं नु देव्याः
स्तनयुगले जघनस्थले च सुप्ता ।
विहगगणरजोविकीर्णदण्डा
प्रतिभयमध्युषिताक्षरश्रयवासम् ॥६.१॥

The various facts in connection with the sunset are enumerated in I. 16 :

खगा वासोपेताः सलिलमवगाढो मुनिजनः
प्रदीप्तोऽग्निर्भाति प्रविचरति धूमो मुनिवनम् ।
परिभ्रष्टो दूराद्विरपि च संछिन्नकिरणो
रथं व्यावर्त्यासौ प्रविशति शनैरस्तशिखरम् ॥

This description of the flock of cranes flying in the sky is most apt and natural, supplying us with the fusion of *Upamā*, *Utprekṣā* and *Svabhāvokti* :

ऋज्वायतां च विरलां च नतोन्नतां च
सप्तर्षिवंशकुटिलां च निवर्तनेषु ।
निर्मुच्यमानभुजगोदरनिर्मलस्य
सीमामिवाम्बरतलस्य विभज्यमानाम् ॥४.२॥

CĀRUDATTA.

Title. The hero of the piece is named Cārudatta and hence according to the rule that नायिकानायकाख्यानात्संज्ञा प्रकरणादिषु । (*Sāhityadarpaṇa*, VI. 143) the piece is also called the *Cārudatta*.

Plot. The place of action is Ujjain. The play begins abruptly without any sort of benedictory stanzas, by the speech of the stage-manager who employs Prakrit contrary to the well-established practice. The stage-manager is tired and hungry due to his morning walk and finds preparations made for a right royal dinner at his house. To his queries the mistress jestingly replies that every thing was ready—in the market. She then tells him of her new *vrata* called Abhirūpapati and asks him to invite a poor Brāhmaṇa for dinner. He goes out and sees Maitreya, the friend of the hero, and invites him saying that, in addition to a sumptuous dinner, there would be golden *dakṣiṇā* ; but Maitreya declines the invitation and the stage-manager goes out to find another Brāhmaṇa. Then Maitreya indulges in a long soliloquy which informs us of the former opulent circumstances of Cārudatta who is now reduced to poverty. Maitreya used to dine out in order not to burden his poor friend. Now he is on his way to deliver to the hero his jasmine-scented garment. Then follow dialogues between Cārudatta and Maitreya, in which the former dilates on the woes of poverty, his changed circumstances and atmosphere and his friend tries to soothe and comfort him ; and the hero finally says that, being fortunate in having a noble wife and a constant friend, he is certainly not poor. From the other side of the stage are introduced the courtesan Vasantasenā, pursued by Śakāra, the brother-in-law of the king, and Viṭa, his attendant. It is night and pitch-dark ; the street is deserted, and both the men declare their intention of kidnapping her. In her fright she calls out to her servants and Śakāra ridicules her. She gets no response and decides to protect her person herself. Viṭa and Śakāra try to terrorize her into submission by showing their weapons. In reply to Viṭa, who says that being a courtesan she should treat all alike, Vasantasenā retorts that she desires connections with gentlemen only. The villain unwittingly gives out that the back-door of the house of Cārudatta, who was the object of the love of Vasantasenā, was nearby. This information puts Vasantasenā in better spirits. She feels along the wall in darkness for the door of the house, gives her pursuers the slip, and awaits her chance at the door. At that precise moment the hero sends out his maid Radanikā

to offer oblations to the mother goddesses at the cross-roads, and Maitreya accompanies her with a lamp. No sooner do they open the door than the courtesan puts out the lamp, effects her entry into the house, and stands in a corner in front of the hero. The maid is mistaken for Vasantasenā by Śakāra, and he and the Viṭa harass her. Maitreya comes to her rescue, and through him Śakāra demands that Cārudatta should deliver Vasantasenā to him (Śakāra) or else there would ensue a never-ending enmity between them. In the meantime Cārudatta takes Vasantasenā for his maid and asks her to carry his garment inside. She accepts the garment but stands still, being unaware of the inner apartments of the house. Cārudatta, owing to his inferiority complex, interprets this immediately as an affront by his maid, but Maitreya and Radanikā enter just then. Maitreya delivers the message of Śakāra, and Vasantasenā comes forward and claims protection. Mutual apologies follow between the lovers. Stating that she was pursued for the sake of her ornaments, Vasantasenā deposits them with the hero. Despite Maitreya's protest, Cārudatta accepts the deposit and entrusts it to the care of Maitreya who arranges with Radanikā that she should be the custodian on *ṣaṣṭhī* and the next day, and that he would take charge of the deposit on *aṣṭmi*. The hero then asks Maitreya to escort the courtesan home without any lamp as the moon had by then flooded the streets with its light. (Act I).

The next day her maid asks Vasantasenā who was in a thoughtful mood the reason thereof. In the course of their conversation it comes out that Vasantasenā has set her heart, contrary to her profession, on a poor Brahmin named Cārudatta, and that in order to make him easy of approach to her without impairing his self-respect, she has deposited her ornaments with him. Suddenly a shampooer rushes in and asks for protection from his creditor. He tells Vasantasenā that he was born at Pāṭaliputra but had to leave that place through his ill-luck, and had to earn his livelihood at Ujjain as a shampooer. He served with a rich man, but was at present unemployed owing to the changed circumstances of his master. Then he took to gambling for his living, had lost ten gold coins therein and was being pursued by

the master of the gaming house. It transpires that his master was none else than the courtesan's lover, Cārudatta. She then pays off the dues of the shampooer who requests her to keep him in her employment; but she cleverly puts him off, and so he leaves with the intention of renouncing the world.

Some noise is then heard from outside and Karṇapūraka, a page of Vasantasenā, rushes in with the story of his valour in saving a monk from the clutches of a mad elephant, and says that his mistress had missed the sight. The whole crowd, he continues, cheered him, but none save a noble person thought of rewarding him. The noble man felt for his ornaments, but finding none heaved a sigh, and presented his upper garment to him in appreciation of his bravery. The page did not know the name of the person, but says that just then he was passing by the road outside. The courtesan and her maid go to the balcony of the house to have a glimpse of the benefactor who proves to be Cārudatta. (Act II).

The next day Cārudatta returns home with his companion late at night from a concert. The hero approvingly speaks of the music and the singer. After washing the feet, both enter the house and prepare to sleep. Radanikā entrusts the casket of ornaments to the care of Maitreya. Cārudatta is drowsing but Maitreya continues his chatter, and finally both fall asleep. A short while after, Sajjalaka, a Brahmin thief misled by the grand appearance of Cārudatta's mansion, bores a hole into one of its outer walls. He realizes that his action is immoral, but he has to do it (in order to obtain money for securing the freedom of his lady-love Madanikā who was the maid of Vasantasenā). Entering the house, Sajjalaka finds that the occupants are fast asleep and that the owner is a poor man. So he thinks of retracing his steps when Maitreya, in his sleep, delivers the box of ornaments to Sajjalaka, dreaming that he was handing them over to Cārudatta. Sajjalaka goes off with the booty and the morning trumpets are sounded. Cārudatta's maid discovers the hole in the wall and Maitreya boasts of his prudence in giving the ornaments to the hero at the right moment. But Cārudatta guesses

the true state of affairs and is worried at the loss of the ornaments and the consequent blot on his character. His wife, on knowing of the theft, sacrifices her pearl-necklace in order that it may be used as compensation for the loss suffered by the courtesan, under the guise of a gift to a Brahmin. The hero is deeply touched, feels much grieved to accept such help from his wife, but seeing that his refusal will pain her a good deal, he accepts it and saying that the necklace is not the value of the ornaments but of the trust with which the courtesan had deposited her valuables, dispatches Maitreya to Vasantasenā with the pearl-necklace. (Act III).

The next act opens with the love-lorn Vasantasenā and her maid, the former with a picture-board and engaged in painting the figure of Cārudatta as he was seen on the previous day when the elephant had run amok. The maid finds the picture quite life-like and compliments her lady's lover as cupid incarnate. Another maid approaches from Vasantasenā's mother with ornaments and a message to wear them and proceed in the carriage awaiting at the door. On learning that the villain Śakāra had sent the ornaments and the carriage, the courtesan rejects them, and dismisses the maid to inform her mother that she would adorn herself when going to Cārudatta. Sajjalaka, the thief, then makes his entry, referring to his vile deed and stating that he needed money to buy freedom for his beloved Madanikā. He calls her aloud and they both engage in conversation, Vasantasenā overhearing them after finding that it related to herself. Sajjalaka places the stolen ornaments which both the ladies recognize as belonging to Vasantasenā. He further tells Madanikā of his crime, and the ladies are relieved to hear, after knowing it was Cārudatta's house which Sajjalaka burgled, that none was injured. Sajjalaka suspects some ill motive in Madanikā, but after knowing the true state of affairs, realizes the full import of his guilt and seeks Madanikā's counsel. She advises him to approach Vasantasenā and return the jewellery in the name of Cārudatta. She then asks him to wait a while and goes to announce him to her ladyship. Meanwhile another maid enters and informs Vasantasenā of the arrival of a Brahmin from

Cārudatta. He is much wonder-struck at the royal mansion of Vasantasenā who greets him and pays him all respects. Then he delivers the pearl-necklace to Vasantasenā, saying that Cārudatta had lost the ornaments pledged by her in gambling and in exchange had sent the necklace. She wavers for a moment, but accepts it asking Maitreya to inform Cārudatta accordingly. Maitreya then leaves thinking slightly of Vasantasenā. Madanikā then enters saying that a messenger from Cārudatta had arrived. The messenger is duly received and he gives the ornaments to Vasantasenā stating that Cārudatta returned them as his house was unsafe. She asks Sajjalaka (for it is he who has presented himself as Cārudatta's messenger) to give them back to Cārudatta, which he declines to do; so Vasantasenā says he must have stolen them from Cārudatta. This greatly unnerves the burglar. Then Vasantasenā orders a carriage to be made ready and calls her maid Madanikā. The maid is loaded with ornaments from Vasantasenā. Hearing that the carriage was ready Vasantasenā lovingly embraces her maid and places her hand in that of her burglar lover, asking him to marry his beloved, as she was now rendered Āryā. After the couple had left, Vasantasenā calls another maid and tells her everything, wondering as if all that was a day-dream. The maid replies that an *Amṛtāṅka Nāṭaka* had been staged as it were. Vasantasenā then prepares to visit Cārudatta with the necklace, but finds the sky overcast with clouds threatening a storm. This makes her impatient and she at once proceeds to her lover. The play suddenly ends here without any epilogue or anything suggesting its close. (Act IV).

Deviations. As indicated above, while considering the sources of the plays no precise source for the *Cār* was found, and hence we are not in a position to show the exact contribution of the poet to the story as he got it. The broad outlines of the plot were possibly taken ready made by the poet. Śakāra with all his eccentricities, mannerisms etc. is the special creation of our poet, and Śūdraka carried the type to perfection. As regards the political bye-plot that is found in the *Mṛcch* (which will be considered in a short note later on), we take it to

have been added by the later writer : the revolution is not at all necessary for the development of the plot. It is very loosely connected with the main story in the *Mṛcch*. The first reference to the political episode comes in the second act of the *Mṛcch* : कथितं च मम प्रियवयस्येन शर्विलकेन यथा किल आर्यकनामा गोपालदारकः सिद्धादेशेन समादिष्टो राजा भविष्यतीति। सर्वश्चास्मद्विधो जनस्तमनुसरति। तद्दहमपि तत्समीपमेव गच्छामि। (p. 41) and later on Śarvilaka while going home with Madanikā learns of the incarceration of Āryaka by Pālaka (Act IV, p. 77). If these references are omitted altogether, the major portion of the sixth act, the whole of the seventh act and the concluding portion of the tenth act in the *Mṛcch* are eliminated, there remains no trace of the political episode without any detriment to the development of the dramatic action.[1] It can easily be separated from the main story, and credit must be given to the author of the *Mṛcch* for skilfully welding the two unconnected episodes together so as to create the impression of a harmonious whole. Śarvilaka is the only weak link connecting the main plot with the bye-plot and it is his joining the party of Āryaka that enables him to show his gratitude to Vasantasenā for her obligations. According to Dr. Charpentier, the Pālaka-Āryaka story is absolutely unnecessary and serves no apparent purpose in the drama.[2]

Type of drama. The *Cār* belongs to the *Prakaraṇa* type of drama which is thus defined in the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* (VI. 224-226).

भवेत्प्रकरणे वृत्तं लौकिकं कविकल्पितम्॥
शृङ्गारोङ्गी नायकस्तु धीरोऽमात्योऽथवा वणिक्।
सापायधर्मकामार्थपरो धीरप्रशान्तकः॥
नायिका कुलजा क्वापि वेश्या क्वापि द्वयं क्वचित्।
तेन भेदाख्ययुक्तस्य तत्र भेदस्तृतीयकः॥
कितवधूर्तकारादिविटचेटकसङ्कुलः।

The plot has been taken from the popular store or may be supposed to have been the poet's invention ; the characters are ordinary people of the world. Love is the principal sentiment. The hero is a Brahmin following the profession of a Vaṇik, *dhiralalita* in nature and fallen on bad days. There are two heroines a *kulajā* and a *veśyā*.

1 Cf. Charpentier, *JRAS*, 1923, pp. 605-607. 2 *JRAS*, 1923, p. 606.

Viṭa and Śakāra are to be met with. The *Bhāvaprakāśana* enjoins that the *kulajā* heroine should employ Sanskrit, but the Vadhūḥ in the *Cār* speaks in Prakrit.[1] The number of acts is required to be from five to ten, but the existence of the lesser number (*viz.*, only 4) in the *Cār* is to be justified on the ground that the *Cār*, as we have it, is a fragment and that its sequel contained at least three more acts.[2]

Sentiments etc. Love, of course, is the main sentiment, the love-affair between Sajjalaka and Madanikā serving as an *Upakathānaka*; but other sentiments also occasionally occur. Thus, for instance, pathos is furnished by the poverty of the hero, the condition of Vasantasenā at the hands of the villain, and her love-lorn state in separation from Cārudatta. The scene of house-breaking at night is an instance of wonder. But the peculiarity of the *Cār* lies in its humour which is supplied by Bhāsa's masterpiece, Śakāra. The major part of the praise showered on Śūdraka for the creation of Śakāra now justly belongs to Bhāsa. "From farce to tragedy, from satire to pathos", says Dr. Ryder, "runs the story, with a breath truly Shakespearean". As regards humour, Dr. Ryder says: "Śūdraka's humour is the third of his vitally distinguishing qualities. This humour has an American flavour in its puns and in its situations".[3]

The phenomenon of moon-rise flooding the dark streets with light showing the rays as streams of milk from the heavens is beautifully expressed by the fusion of *Upamā* and *Rūpaka* (I. 29):

उदयति हि शशाङ्कः क्षिप्तखर्जूरपाण्डु-
र्युवतिजनसहायो राजमार्गप्रदीपः।
तिमिरनिचयमध्ये रश्मयो यस्य गौरा
हृतजल इव पङ्के क्षीरधाराः पतन्ति॥

Similarly the setting of the moon is effectively described later on (III. 3) by another *Upamā* comparing

---

1 *Bhāvaprakāśana*, GOS, No. 40, pp. 241-242 (especially p. 242 line 10); also *Daśarūpa*, III. 39-42; *Nāṭyaśāstra*, XVIII. 98-106; *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, GOS, No. 48, pp. 117-120, 175; Mankad, *Types of Sanskrit Drama*, pp. 51-55. 2 Cf. Gupta pp. 151-154 and the references stated there; also Woolner and Sarup, *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Vol. I, p. 72. 3 The *Little Clay Cart*, HOS, Vol. 9, Intr., pp. XVIII, XXII. The statements relate to Śūdraka but apply to Bhāsa.

the arch of the moon disappearing in darkness with the tusk of a wild elephant out for bath gradually entering the waters :

असौ हि दृश्या तिमिरावकाश-
मस्तं गतो ह्यष्टमपक्षचन्द्रः ।
तोयावगाढस्य वनद्विपस्य
विषाणकोटीव निमज्जमाना ॥

Bhāsa's patent simile of the flash of lightning in the clouds is seen here associated with the *Anumāna* (I. 18) :[1]

कामं प्रदोषतिमिरेण न दृश्यसे त्वं
सौदामनीव जलदोदरसन्निरुद्धा ।
त्वां सूचयिष्यति हि वायुवशोपनीतो
गन्धश्च शब्दमुखराणि च भूषणानि ॥

The lute is finely compared with a female companion, pastime, wife, and co-wife, which supply us with *Upamā*, *Rūpaka* and *Atiśayokti* (III. 1) :

उत्कण्ठितस्य हृदयानुगता सखीव
सङ्कीर्णदोषरहिता विषयेषु गोष्ठी ।
क्रीडारसेषु मदनव्यसनेषु कान्ता
स्त्रीणां तु कान्तरतिविघ्नकरी सपत्नी ॥

Cārudatta's observations on poverty are full of profound truth expressed in a number of figures. The condition of a rich man fallen on evil days is stated to be like a dead man having a body (I. 3—*Upamā* and *Virodhābhāsa*) :

सुखं हि दुःखान्यनुभूय शोभते
यथान्धकारादिव दीपदर्शनम् ।
सुखात्तु यो याति दशां दरिद्रतां
स्थितः शरीरेण मृतः स जीवति ॥

Similarly, I. 2 is an instance of *Paryāya*, I. 5 of *Kāvyaliṅga* and *Virodhābhāsa*, and I. 6 of *Kāraka Dīpaka*.

Anumānālaṁkāra, at which Bhāsa is a master-hand, is found in the description of the condition of a man in deep sleep (III. 13), which also illustrates *Samuccaya* :[2]

---

1 For similar *Upamās* cf. *Ait.* VI. 20 ; *Abh.* II. 7 ; *Dv.* 7. 47. 2 For *Anumāna*, cf. *Svapna*, I. 12 ; V 4 ; पादाक्रान्तानि पुष्पाणि (IV. 2A.).

निःश्वासोऽस्य न शङ्कितो न विषमस्तुल्यान्तरं जायते
गात्रं सन्धिषु दीर्घितामुपगतं शय्याप्रमाणाधिकम्।
दृष्टिर्गाढनिमीलिता न चपलं पक्ष्मान्तरं जायते
दीपे चैव न मर्षयेदभिमुखः स्वाङ्गत्वमुक्तो यदि॥

Some of the notable figures are: *Upamā* and *Utprekṣā* (III. 4) describing the effects of sleep; *Upamā* and *Kāvyaliṅga* (I. 17); *Kāvyaliṅga* and *Utprekṣā* (I. 21); *Ākṣepa* (III. 2); *Parikara* (III. 14, IV. 4); *Ullekha* (III. 11); *Arthāntaranyāsa* (III. 15, IV. 6); *Upamā* (I. 9, 11, 26, 27; III. 5, IV. 1, etc.).

Many of the prose passages given as *subhāṣitas* towards the end in an appendix serve as instances of *Arthāntaranyāsa*, *Aprastutaprasaṁsā*, *Anyokti*, *Dṛṣṭānta*, etc.

Critical Study. In an earlier chapter we have considered the relationship between the *Cār* and the *Mṛcch* and have answered some of the contrary views and criticisms on the *Cār.*

The opening scene presents before us a pathetic picture of poverty prevailing in Ujjain, which is effectively contrasted with the subsequent scene immediately following in which Śakāra, Viṭa and Vasantasenā figure, depicting lewdness and looseness of character. In the whole of the first act we have alternating situations. The passion rises to a high pitch and is then relieved by a lighter touch. Moral character and lewdness, pathos and humour, poverty and riches, appear by turns. Similar devices have been used by the poet, as already observed, in a number of plays of this group. The scented garment introduced in this act, like the bark garments in the *Pratimā*, is requisitioned later on for a different purpose. In the second act of the *Cār*, Karṇapūra, a page of Vasantasenā, brings in the same garment, which he has received as a gift from Cārudatta, and the garment serves to enhance the love of Vasantasenā for Cārudatta.

The second act opens in the courtesan's apartments, where she has a talk about her love with her maid. The introduction of the shampooer fans love's fire kindled in the heart of Vasantasenā, which receives impetus towards the close of the act where the elephant is introduced to

emphasize the charitable disposition and generosity of the hero.

In the beginning of the next act, we are confronted with a light affair and humorous talk after the hero returns from a concert; the burglar, however, supplies seriousness, which is at places relieved by Maitreya. The noble traits in the character of the hero and his wedded wife are brought out with a few masterly touches.

The final act paints the heroine portraying her lover, and her mother intending her to sell her charms for money. It also develops the Madanikā-Sajjalaka bye-plot, apparently ending with their proposed marriage. Maitreya's entry with the pearl-necklace intensifies Vasantasenā's longing for Cārudatta and the thunder-storm makes her passionate and she proposes to set out to meet him, but the play suddenly comes to a close at this point.[1]

The play is unique in Sanskrit literature inasmuch as, contrary to the general trend, the heroine is portrayed as making advances to the hero, proclaiming her love to her maids, etc. Bhāsa thus may be said to be exceptional in not following the convention with regard to the love-affair between the hero and the heroine, in which the maiden has to restrain the course of her love from being ventilated; and it is the hero who generally begins love-making This modern look about Vasantasenā is perhaps due to the fact that the heroine belongs to the courtesan type; with all that, however, Vasantasenā is depicted as virtuous, beautiful and steadfast, worthy to be ranked with other heroines of high status such as Śakuntalā, Sītā, Mālatī, etc.

As correctly stated by Dr. Johnston, the dialogue in the *Cār*, as compared with the *Svapna* and *Pratijñā* is "crisper, wittier, more idiomatic, with sharper outlines, the conversation of a cultured *goṣṭhī* refined to a high degree." But we do not contribute to his next statement that it deals with the "exterior facets of life....not the hidden life behind".[2] How smoothly are we acquainted with the love at first sight in the mind of Vasantasenā and its gradual development by delicate touches! The characters

1 Cf. also Woolner and Sarup, *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Vol. I, p. 72.
2 *Id.*, 62, p. 98.

are certainly individuals and not types, and the general impression produced on our mind after reading the *Cār* shows the working of the same master-hand that produced the *Svapna* and *Pratijñā* (and the whole cycle of the Trivandrum Bhāsa plays).

Dr. Keith denies to the characters in the *Mṛcch* (which is but an expanded version of the *Cār* so far as the first four acts go) the appellation of the "citizens of the world" which was first applied by Dr. Ryder.[1] To Dr. Keith they appear to be "redolent of Indian thought and life".[2] The cosmopolitan nature of the *Cār* will be apparent if we compare Śakāra, Maitreya and Madanikā for instance, with the characters in the *Śākuntala*, *Mālati-Mādhava* and other Sanskrit dramas. No doubt Bhāsa could not cast off and entirely divest himself of the Hindu thought and life, and a careful observer will certainly find pieces echoing typically Indian feelings. That does not detract to any extent from the merits of the "citizens of the world".

Lastly, we come to the consideration of the *political revolution*, which we find only in the *Mṛcch*. We have already indicated that it is very loosely connected with the main story. Cārudatta and Vasantasenā are not directly connected with the revolution. The only character that figures in the main plot and the sub-plot is, as previously stated, Śarvilaka (Sajjalaka in the *Cār*). Even before the discovery of the *Cār* there were critics who had drawn attention to the extraneous relation of the political episode with the plot of the *Mṛcch*.[3] The revolution is not at all necessary for the development of the main story; the swapping of the chariots could have been effected without bringing Āryaka, and Cārudatta's innocence could have been proved without Śarvilaka's intercession, by the reappearance of Vasantasenā. The political intrigue runs on parallel lines with the main action and not along with it and hence the second half of the *Mṛcch* (*viz.*, Acts V-X), in the words of Dr. Charpentier, "is partly spoilt by the contamination of two subjects that stood originally in no relation whatsoever to each other".[4] But to the

---

1 *Little Clay Cart*, Intr., p. XVI. 2 *SD*, p. 139. 3 Kirata, Bhāsa's play, Marathi translation, Intr., pp. 218-220 Ryder, *Little Clay Cart*, Intr., p. XXII; cf. Paranjape and Raddi *Mṛcch*, Intr., p. 13. 4 *JRAS*, 1923, p. 607.

contemporary public when the political revolutions were the order of the day, the interweaving was certainly interesting as they could appreciate it and it did not mean bad taste on the part of Śūdraka in the eyes of the spectators of those days.

There has been quite an amount of speculation among oriental scholars as to the historicity of the revolution and the identities of Pālaka and Āryaka, the chief persons figuring therein. Wilson believed long ago that some historical fact lay at the foundation of the Pālaka-Āryaka story and that Pālaka, through his sympathy with the Buddhists and contempt for the Brahmin laws and customs, had himself caused the revolution that robbed him of his kingdom and life.[1] Dr. Charpentier rightly controverts this view stating that, though Pālaka may be taken to have some contempt for Brāhmanas there is no reference in the *Mṛcch* to his having embraced Buddhism ; on the contrary, Pālaka is said to have been killed in a sacrificial enclosure.[2]

Windisch found the influence of the Kṛṣṇa and Kaṁsa legend in the Pālaka-Āryaka story, stating that the prediction of Āryaka's attaining the throne, the jealousy of the king and his attempts to destroy him and the final overthrow of the tyrant had their counterpart in the Kṛṣṇa legend.[3] The similarity, however, according to Dr. Keith, is "really remote," and Dr. Charpentier states that there is only "a vague congruity between the two stories."[4]

Dr. Konow thinks that the story in the *Bṛhatkathā* of the abdication of Pālaka in favour of Āryaka has been drawn upon by Śūdraka.[5] He states that the name Gopāla has been altered to Go-pāla meaning a cowherd, which is the profession of Āryaka. But "the parallel traits between the two stories," says Dr. Charpentier, "are not very striking and if it were not for the name Pālaka one

---

1 Charpentier, *JRAS*, 1923, p. 607. 2 Wilson, *Hindu Theatre*, I, p. 158n; Lévi, *JA*, 1902, I, 123; Charpentier, *JRAS*, 1923, pp. 604-605; Dr. Winternitz also states that the author of the *Mṛcch* shows more sympathy towards Buddhists than the author of the *Cār. Geschichte der ind. Litt*, III, p. 205 ff. 3 *JRAS*, 1923, p. 605; also *Mṛcch*, X. 50. 4 *BSGW*, 1885, p. 439 sq. Resemblance has been shown between Vasantasenā and Yoganidrā and between the exchange of litters and that of children (cf. Lévi, *Theatre Indien*). 5 Keith, *SD*, p. 100; Charpentier, *JRAS*, 1923, p. 606. 6 *ID*, p. 57.

would scarcely think of bringing them in connection with each other.'"

Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, however, on the strength of the authority of the *Puraṇas* and the *Kathāsaritsāgara* states the historical fact to be that Pradyota Mahāsena of Ujjain was not succeeded by Gopāla, but by his younger brother Pālaka; and that Āryaka, the son of Gopāla conspired against his uncle and succeeded in usurping the throne.[2]

Mr. Deb tries to identify Āryaka with king Udayana Vatsarāja himself, taking Āryaka of the *Purāṇas* to be a variant of Udayana; and further taking *Gopāla Prakṛti* and *Gopāla Dāraka* in the *Mṛcch* in connection with Āryaka to contain *a veiled reference* to Udayana's "permanent epithet" Vatsarāja ("Lord of Calves," literally); he finds support for the idea in the simile used by Śarvilaka comparing Āryaka to Udayana.[3] Why not then take Śarvilaka to be Yaugandharāyaṇa? The entire line of arguments seems to be wholly fanciful.

According to Prof. Dhruva the political revolution refers to that which occurred in 187 B. C. in Pāṭaliputra.[4]

Dr. Charpentier states that Pālaka cannot be historically identified and takes the name to be the shortened form of a compound name ending in Pāla.[5] We think there is an amount of truth in the incidents contained in the *Bṛhatkathā* supported as they are by the *Purāṇas* and other accounts.[6]

Now Bhāsa himself has referred to Pālaka and Gopālaka; so he could have easily incorporated the bye-plot in the main love story had he meant it. But, as we find, the two stories are quite disconnected. It is not clear what propriety Śūdraka, the later writer, found in weaving the revolution that took place centuries before him with the ready-made drama, *viz.*, the *Cār* of Bhāsa that he came across. In an article entitled "Authorship and Date of the *Mṛcch*," we have tried to show that Śūdraka, the author of the *Mṛcch* was the founder of the Āndhras and

---

1 *JRAS*, 1923, p. 606. 2 *Carm. Lect.* pp. 64-65. Ajjaka was first identified with Āryaka by Jayaswal. *JBORS*, 1915, p. 107. 3 *JASB* 1933, pp. 342-345 on p. 345. 4 *Śūdra Svapna*, Intr., p. 15. 5 *JRAS*, 1923, p. 605. 6 Cf. Pargiter, *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, pp. 18, 19, 68. For Buddhist and Jain accounts about Pālaka and Āryaka as also the revolution, cf. Deb, *JASB* 1933, pp. 340-349.

have assigned him to the third or the second century B. C.[1] In the absence of the detailed historical facts of the period, it is not possible to state definitely which particular contemporary revolution Śūdraka had in mind while referring to the Pālaka-Āryaka story. We know that in those troubled times political upheavals were often witnessed, and it was because the people of the day could easily appreciate the veiled references that Śūdraka embodied the revolution. Lapse of a long period has resulted in the loss of all its meaning and importance to us and hence we find 'bad taste' in the addition of the revolution.

The *Cār* (p. 58) has the expression गच्छदु ··· पुणोदंसणा in common with the *Svapna*, (p. 36), *Avi* (p. 67), *Bāl* (p. 67), *Mv* (p. 42) and *Dv* (p. 30). Similarly the expression सव्वं दाव चिट्ठदु is found in the *Cār* (pp. 5, 85), *Pratijñā* (p. 58), *Avi* (p. 85), and *Bāl* (p. 38). Curiously enough, the *Cār* has got comparatively a larger number of echoes of thoughts and expression with the *Svapna* than with any other play of the group.

Finally, we shall close our study of the Bhāsa plays by considering (1) the causes that contributed to the neglect or want of circulation of these plays, (2) possible reasons why the plays are anonymous, and (3) possibility of unearthing the plays elsewhere in India.

Causes of Neglect. Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri tried to find out the causes that led to the neglect of these plays. According to him, absence of merits, existence of irregularities of language, and omission of the name of the poet cannot be such causes; and hence he says that owing to some mysterious reason, similar to that which was responsible for the disappearance of *Vyāḍisaṁgraha*

---

1 Submitted to the Ninth All-India Oriental Conference at Trivandrum, and accepted for publication in the *JAHRS*. 2 *Svapna*, Intr., pp. 19-20; *Pratimā*, Intr., pp. 37-38; *Critical Study*, pp. 77-79. For striking resemblances between the *Svapna* and the *Cār*, cf: गच्छदु पुनर्दर्शनाय । (*Svapna*, p. 36; *Cār*, p. 58); सव्वं आणेदु वक्खित्त भोअणं । (*Svapna*, p. 62; *Cār*, p. 98); (कर्णे) एव्वं किल (*Svapna*, p. 89; *Cār*, p. 95, also p. 51); को कालो । (*Svapna*, pp. 52, 61; *Cār*, p. 65) अले दाणिं भवं अदिमत्तं सन्तप्पिअ । (*Svapna*, p. 123; *Cār*, p. 12) etc. Then there are three acts in these plays (*Svapna* Acts II and III; *Cār*, Act II) without any verse. Vidūṣaka in the *Svapna* as well as in the *Cār* is an intelligent companion of the hero, not a mere gluttonous buffoon. Vāsavadattā in the *Svapna*, and Brāhmaṇī (Cārudatta's wife) in the *Cār* are not jealous, but show sisterly regard for Padmāvatī and Vasantasenā respectively.

or *Bṛhatkathā*, these plays went out of vogue. Further he says that in course of time many *rūpakas* came to be written and the newer compositions gradually ousted the old *rūpakas* which finally vanished. Kings favoured their special court poets, patronized their compositions, and did all in their hands to bring the new *rūpakas* to the forefront. All these appear plausible, but are not convincing. Parallel instance of the *Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra* which was discovered only recently from the South, lends some colour to the view that some unknown cause other than want of merits and similar apparent causes is responsible for the unmerited oblivion into which these *rūpakas* fell.

Dr. Keith says that Bhāsa was a poet of the South and a devout Vaiṣṇava and his dramas suffered from the general Mohammedan objection to everything Hindu. But the learned Doctor further observes that this is a mere conjecture.[1] Now we have already shown above that Bhāsa was a northerner ; and again we find that many works of orthodox devout Brāhmaṇas have survived the Mohammedan onslaught. So these conjectures are not sound.

According to Dr. Raja, these dramas are second-rate compositions written simply for the stage and were never intended as literature, and hence they were confined to theatre only, and thus were ignored by the scholars.[2] It is shown above that these are not stage adaptations or works by Cākyārs. Judging from the standards of literary criticism enunciated by rhetoricians and writers on poetics, these plays cannot be dismissed as second-rate compositions. Showers of praise heaped on Bhāsa by his successors in the field also show the high respect in which his works were held centuries after his time, precluding thereby the idea of their being inferior productions.

Dr. Weller finds that the comparative freedom of method and simplicity of style of Bhāsa are responsible for his neglect.[3] As to the latter it may be stated that simplicity of style is a merit (*Kāvya-guṇa*) in a *rūpaka*. The former smacks of verisimilitude; it is possible that the subsequent enforcement of the rules of Bharata

1 *SD*, p. 105. 2 XII, 2, p. 260. 3 Weller, *Abenteuer des Knaben Krischna*, Intr.; Thomas, *IA*, 1923, p. 186.

lowered these works in public estimation and interested parties made use of this to withhold these works from circulation.

That these plays were current more or less till the date of Kālidāsa is evident from the latter's eulogistic references to Bhāsa. It seems likely that by the time of Kālidāsa there was a change in popular taste, as would appear from the comparison of the works of Bhāsa with those of Kālidāsa. The older works failed to make a popular appeal. The sacerdotal, religious and other contemporary references gradually lost their value to the people as there was a change in the general popular outlook.[1]

These works preached orthodox Brahmanism and hence naturally were not liked by the Buddhists and Jains. These dramas therefore were current till the date of Agnimitra, who was an upholder of the Vedic religion. It seems that after this period the general tendency of the literary compositions was sympathetic towards and favouring the Buddhist and Jain tenets which had gained royal favour. These works thus gradually fell from currency and by the time of Vāmana (8th century A. D.) and subsequent writers on rhetorics and dramaturgy they appear to have been handed down from memory and oral tradition. The rhetoricians are not correct in their quotations.

A fourteenth century work hailing from the South, however, actually quotes from and names some of the plays in this group indicating thereby that it relied on the same texts as we have them in the Trivandrum editions.[2] How did these plays find their way to the South and among the Cākyār repertoire? The Pāṇḍya, Cola and Kerala kings were patrons of learning and champions of Brahmanism. They had their own actors who staged Sanskrit dramas in the Palace theatres. Bhāsa's works appealed to these actors and the court-poets and pandits, because in addition to being wonderfully adapted to the

---

1 I am indebted to Kirāta for some of the suggestions made by him in this connection as the result of the inspiring and instructive talk I had with him. I have incorporated only such possibilities that appeared to me to be tenable out of those that occurred to my mind. 2 *supra* pp. 24, 33. *Śākuntalavyākhyā* or *Śākuntalacarcā* (R. No. 2778 in Govt. Or. Mss. Lib. Madras) mentions among others, the *Cār. Dyh, Paāc, Bāl, Svapna*, and *Avi* from the Bhāsa plays.

stage, they related to the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* personages, were didactic, and glorified sacrifices, *dakṣiṇā*, *dāna* and similar virtues prized by the Hindus.

Why anonymous ? Neither want of merit nor their being the stage versions can be the reason why these plays have come to us without the name of their author being appended to them.[1]

We think that in Bāṇa's time these plays were not anonymous as he has not mentioned anonymity as the characteristic feature of Bhāsa's works. After these works were introduced into the South and formed part of the Cākyār repertory, they were possibly accepted without affixing the author's name thereto, and all excepting the select few came to look upon these works as hailing from the South. Absence of circulations of these plays except in the south and the staging of select acts from these works without mentioning the author's name made their association with Bhāsa appear quite impossible.

Taking the plays to be anonymous from the beginning and not after the time of Bāṇa as we have stated above, the possible reasons for their anonymity appear to be the following : (1) The rule of Bharata with regard to the mentioning of the name of the author in common with some other rules was not obligatory in the days of Bhāsa.[2] The texts on dramaturgy of those days appear to have allowed these 'lapses'. In course of time, by the period of Kālidāsa, Bharata was strictly followed and breaches of his dicta were looked as sacrilegious. (2) Or perhaps the poet might have purposely kept off his name as actors, dramatists etc. were not held in repute by the orthodox Hindus as the *Arthaśāstra*, the epics, and the *Smṛtis* tend to show.[3] The name of the author was known to a select few, and later it remained associated only with the *Svapna*, the relationship with the other plays evidently not mattering much with the Pandits.

Possibility of finding Bhāsa manuscripts elsewhere in India. The Southern manuscripts of Bhāsa

---

1 Cf. Chapters II, III, V., VII, VIII. Contra, Raja, *ZII*, 2, p. 260, cf. Sukthankar, *JBRAS*, 1925, p. 139. 2 Cf. Chapter IV—(9) Bhāsa and Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*; the other rules as to fight, sleep, death, etc. on the stage. 3 *Arthaśāstra*, II, 26, p. 48; *Rāmāyaṇa*, II. 30. 8; *Mbh*, IV. 17. 43; *Manusmṛti*, III. 1556; IV. 64. 218; and other *Smṛtis*.

unearthed so far offer no material textual variations and may safely be taken to represent their being the descendants of the same original versions of the Bhāsa plays. References to Bhāsa and his works are found in writers coming from such far off places as Kashmir (Vāmana, Abhinavagupta), Nepal (Sāgaranandin), Gujarat and Kathiawar (Rāmacandra, Hemacandra) and Mahārāṣṭra (Rājaśekhara).[1] These testify to the all India reputation of the poet and the currency of his works in the whole sub-continent. So it appears likely that, if a vigorous search is made throughout the length and breadth of India, especially in the North, in educational and religious centres such as Benares, Nalanda, Patna etc. as well as in the Palace libraries and private collections, some manuscripts of Bhāsa would surely be discovered and, as indicated earlier, this will help a good deal in arriving at some definite and incontrovertible conclusion with regard to the Bhāsa problem.

---

1 See Chapters II and III.

BOOK II

SOCIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS OF THE PERIOD AS REVEALED FROM THE WORKS OF BHĀSA.

CHAPTER IX.

INTRODUCTORY.

We now come to the most important, informative and interesting part of our study in dealing with the sociological conditions of the period as revealed from the works of Bhāsa. It has already been stated as our considered view that Bhāsa belongs to the pre-Mauryan or at least the Mauryan period, and our conclusion would be strengthened if it could be shown that there exist striking parallelisms between the social conditions as portrayed in Bhāsa and those obtained from the works of the Mauryan period. This would be a very strong proof in favour of the antiquity of Bhāsa, as close similarities in peculiar social customs necessarily indicate proximity in time, and judging from the difficulties experienced even today in getting at ancient historical material in this vast continent, those in the remote period may better be imagined than described, the more so, if the poet did not belong to the period we ascribe to him. It would be impossible for an author coming centuries after the Mauryan period to incorporate in his works some minute peculiarities of the epoch ; and the possibility of his hailing from the South is necessarily excluded if the portrayal of the sociological conditions of our poet agrees remarkably with those of the Mauryan age. It may rightly be contended that many of the customs that were observed in quite ancient times are strictly adhered to even in these days. The sociological conditions of different epochs in India present many striking similarities, thanks to the conservatism and orthodoxy of the people. On the contrary, India being a vast expanse of land containing peoples of various races

and religions since the ancient times, there are found to be diversities in the sociological conditions in a single period between different provinces; many divergent practices again are seen to exist side by side in the same or in different provinces. It cannot be denied, nevertheless, that there are some peculiar characteristics of a particular period that are not to be found in subsequent or earlier epochs, and which, therefore, may rightly be called the distinguishing features of that period. In the following pages every section dealing with a social problem contains a short introductory historical sketch describing the development of that particular topic from the Vedic times down to the period of the *Arthaśāstra*, which, as we shall presently show in brief, belongs to the Mauryan age. No reference has been made to the subsequent periods. After tracing the vicissitudes of a particular social, political or religious problem under different periods, we have given the information supplied by our works in regard to the problem showing the state of affairs at the period of our poet. Readers are left to judge for themselves as to the particular period with which the sociological conditions described in our works closely agree, though at places we have referred to some resemblances in foot-notes.

The age of the *Rgveda* as to the date of which there is a good deal of difference of opinion among orientalists has been taken as the starting point. Scholars variously put the date between 25000 B. C. and 700 B. C., the generally accepted view being to place the period in the second millenium before Christ following Max Müller.[1] Rightly has the late Rev. Father Zimmermann drawn the attention of scholars in this connection to the differences of view-point that naturally arise between those who reside thousands of miles away from India and those residing nearer the scene of action.[2] Without entering into details as to the discussion of the date of the *Rgveda*, we may state that the reasonable view appears to be that which puts the Vedic civilization at about 4500 B. C. propounded by Dr. Jacobi and

1 25000 B. C.—A. C. Das; 11000.—S. V. Venkateswara; 6000 B. C.—Tilak; 4500 B. C.—Jacobi; 2780-1820 B. C.—Weber; 2400-2000 B. C.—Haug; 2000 B. C.—Winternitz; 2050-1600 B. C.—Pargiter; 1400-1200 B. C.—Macdonell, Keith; 700 B. C.—Waddell. 2 *Hymns from the Rgveda*, Bom. Sans. Ser. No. 58, Second Ed., Preface, p. vii.

Lok. Tilak, which estimate is "not *prima facie* incredible" according to Dr. Bühler.[1] For the social conditions of the Vedic age, we mainly rely on our own study of the *Ṛgveda* and also on the works of Dr. Winternitz and other scholars.

Next in chronological order comes the age of the Indus culture. All the European archæologists and scholars and most of those from India have placed the Indus civilization in the pre-Aryan period in India. They have provisionally assigned the period 3250-2750 B. C. to the Indus Valley culture, and the so-called Aryan invasion of India cannot be placed, according to them, before 2000 B. C.[2] Elsewhere, we have briefly dealt with the "Authors of the Indus Culture" where we have shown that the age of the Indus culture is *post-Ṛgvedic*.[3] Prof. Viswanatha, Prof. Venkatesvara, Prof. Dikshitar, Dr. Sarup and others rightly opine that the Indus civilization flourished between the period of "the earliest Vedic *mantras* and the time when the Atharva practices had come to be recognized as part and parcel of the religion of the Hindus."[4] We depend on our own impressions and conclusions formed about the social conditions of the Indus period from the information gathered from the study of the monumental works by Sir John Marshall supplemented by the equally magnificent volumes brought out by Dr. Ernest Mackay and the reports of the Archæological Department as also the vast literature on the subject.[5] With regard to most of the topics dealt with in the following pages, such as *Varṇāśramadharma*, Marriage Laws, Political Organisation, Literature, Social Life etc., no information could be gleaned from the sociological conditions of the period of the Indus Civilization as the data furnished by

---

1 *IA*, 1894, p. 248. 2 Marshall, *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization* Vol. I. pp. 102-106; Doctors Mackay, Langdon, Konow, Thomas, Keith, Woolley, Fabri, Krishnaswami Aiyangar, K. N. Dikshit, Daya Ram Sahni and others have expressed their approval of the date proposed by Sir John Marshall. 3 *ABI*, XVIII, pp. 385-395. 4 Viswanatha, *Racial Synthesis*, p. 28; also Venkatesvara, *Aryan Path*, 1930, pp. 11-15; 1934, pp. 86-90; Dikshitar, The Culture of the Indus Valley (Rep. from *Mad. Univ. Journ.* Jan. 1934); N. N. Law, *IHQ*, VIII, pp. 121-164; Sarup, *Gangā*, 1933, pp. 62-69; *IC*, IV, pp. 149-169. 5 *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization*, 3 Vols., London, 1931; Mackay, *Further Excavations at Mohenjo-Daro*, 2 Vols. Delhi, 1938; *Indus Civilization*, London, 1935; Childe, *New Light on the Most Ancient East*, London 1934; *Annual Reports of the Archæological Survey of India*, 1927 onwards; and a number of articles by these scholars and by Fabri, Frankfort and others.

the archæological remains are necessarily silent on such subjects.

Then we come to the epic age, *viz.*, the period of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Though the epics came to be written at a comparatively late period, the age of the actual events described in the epics goes back to the later phases of the Vedic period. Indian opinion considers the bulk of the epics to have been already written in the pre-Christian epoch. At any rate, it will be generally acceptable, it is hoped, that the social conditions portrayed in the epics relate to a long period embracing some centuries before and after the Buddhist age. We have mainly utilized Mr. Vaidya's "*Epic India*" and "*Upasaṁhāra*" for the social life of the age.[1]

Then comes the Buddhist age of which the *Jātakas* have been taken as the representative literature. Whatever be the age of the individual *Jātakas*, it will have to be admitted that many *Jātakas* were vastly popular before the third century B. C. as would appear from the bas-reliefs on the stūpas at Barhut and Sanchi, where a number of scenes from the *Jātakas* are carved on the railings round these stūpas.[2] According to Fick, Bühler, Fausböll, Rhys Davids and other Buddhist scholars the social conditions of the *Jātakas* refer at least to the time of Buddha himself and the political conditions show the period before the rise of the Nandas and the Mauryas.[3] In spite of the scepticism of Dr. Winternitz to assign the antiquity claimed by these scholars for the *Jātakas*,[4] we think we are not far from right in stating that the *Jātakas* may be taken to relate the political and social conditions of North India in and before Buddha's time. The kernel of the *Jātaka* stories goes back to the earliest Hindu literature; there was nothing peculiarly Buddhist about them. Verses were added later on to the original stories when they were adapted into the Buddhist scheme of *Jātakas*.[5] The *Jātakas* and other Buddhist writings no doubt show a distinct Kṣatriya bias and look down upon the Brāhmaṇas in contrast to the Brahmanical

1 *Mahābhāratāchā Upasaṁhāra*, Poona, 1918; *Epic India* (First Reprint), Bombay, 1933. 2 Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 190-194. 3 Fick, *Die Sociale Gliderung im Nordostlichen Indien Zu Buddhas Zeit*, pp. vi, vii; G. Bühler, Indian Studies, No. 5, (Vienna, 1896); Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 202 n2, 204 n1, 205, 206. 4 *HIL*, II, pp. 121-123. 5 Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 199, 205-206.

literature of the period which idealizes the Brāhmaṇas; yet the picture of society presented by them is not only not unreliable, but, barring distinct sectarian propaganda, is more faithful.[1] In fact, we get a good deal of realistic information about the life of the common people, their follies and foibles, their sports and amusements, their virtues and vices from the *Jātakas* and allied literature. As the period we have assigned to Bhāsa is not far distant in time from the Buddhist age, there appear to be many similarities in the social conditions of the period as painted by both.

Finally, we have referred to Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, which we have taken as the product of the Mauryan age and hence contemporaneous with the period we have assigned to Bhāsa. Non-mention of the great Brāhmaṇa minister of Candragupta by Megasthenes need not be taken to mean that Kauṭilya or Cāṇakya was a mythical person.[2] For one thing, the *Indika* of Megasthenes is available only in fragments; again *argumentum ex silentio* cannot be relied on too much.[3] The fact that Kauṭilya is eulogized in Brahmanical literature and depreciatory remarks occur about him in the Buddhist and Jain works is sufficient to establish the existence and historicity of Kauṭilya. The discrepancies between Megasthenes and Kauṭilya need not postulate a late date for the latter, since the alleged discrepancies have been shown to be no discrepancies at all.[4] Besides, Megasthenes possessed very little critical judgment, was unacquainted with the language and literature of India, was often misled by wrong information received from others, and has, at places, idealized the Indians.[5] The arguments of Dr. Jolly, Dr. Winternitz, Dr. Keith, Dr. Stein and others questioning the authenticity of Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, casting doubts on the existence of Kauṭilya, the famous Mauryan minister, and relegating the work to the post-Christian period have been ably controverted by Dr. R. Shama Sastri, Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar,

---

1 Fick, *Social Organisation*, Chapters 1, 2; Cowell, *Jātakas*, Vol. I, Intr. 2 Jolly, *Arthaśāstra*, Intr., p. 34. 3 Bhandarkar, *ABI*, VII, p. 68. 4 For discrepancies, cf. Jolly, *op. cit.*, pp. 34–41; Keith, *HSL*, pp. 459–460; Stein, *Megasthenes und Kautilya*, Wien, 1922; etc. Contra, Bhandarkar, *ABI*, VII, pp. 70–72; *Arthaśāstra*, Shama Śāstri, Eng. Trans., Third Ed., Preface, pp. xxxi–xxxiii; etc. 5 Cf. Bhandarkar, *ABI*, VII, p. 68; Ray Chaudhury, *PHAI*, Second Ed., p. 170; also Jolly, *op. cit.*, Intr.

Dr. Jayaswal, Dr. N. N. Law, Prof. P. V. Kane and other orientalists and we need not traverse the same ground here.[1] It is interesting to note in this connection that Dr. Fleet, Dr. Jacobi, Dr. F. W. Thomas and Dr. Vincent Smith are, perhaps, the only European scholars accepting the antiquity of the work.[2] The *Arthaśāstra*, thus, is the work of Kauṭilya or Cāṇakya and naturally belongs to the fourth century B. C. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, however, states that the *Arthaśāstra* as we have it at present cannot go back beyond the first century A. D., the original work of Kauṭilya, according to him, underwent some change of form during the early centuries of the Christian era; he further states that many customs and practices mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra* carry us at least to the fourth century B. C.[3] Dr. Shama Sastri has recently adduced an argument based on astronomical grounds to prove the antiquity of the *Arthaśāstra*.[4] Attention may also be drawn to the Presidential Address of Dr. Jayaswal at the annual meeting of the Numismatic Society of India in 1935, where he has shown how numismatics helps to settle chronology. The antiquity of the *Arthaśāstra* may be proved by reference to the punch-marked coins which conform to the proportion of alloy (*viz.* one-fourth) prescribed by Kauṭilya.[5] The reverse-marks of some 4000 coins examined by Dr. Jayaswal show that the marks were not made in the mint by the Superintendent *(Lakṣaṇādhyakṣa)* but were impressed subsequently, probably by the examiner of coins *(Rūpadarśaka)* of the Treasury Department after examining the "currency-worthiness" of the coins as enjoined by Kauṭilya; some of the coins, further, have the initial of royal names or the royal monogram *(narendrāṅka, rājāṅka)* as laid down by Kauṭilya, beside the imperial Maurya mark,—

---

1 Shama Sastri, *Arthaśāstra*, 1919, Intr., Preface to Eng. trans., 1929, pp. vii-xxxiii; Bhandarkar, *ABI*, VII. pp. 65-84; Jayaswal, *Hindu Polity*, App. I; R. Mookerji, Intr. Essay to *Studies in Ancient Hindu Polity*, pp. x-xxxv; N. N. Law, *Studies in Indian History and Culture*, pp 209-266; Kane, *ABI*, VII, pp. 85-100; Dikshitar, *Mauryan Polity*, p. 19; Ganapati Sastri, *Critical Study*, p. 25. 2 Fleet, Introductory Note to Shama Sastri's trans., pp. v-vi; Jacobi, *SPAW*, xxxviii, pp. 832-849; Thomas, *CHI*, I pp. 467 ff; Smith, *EHI*, 4th Ed., p. 145. 3 *ABI*, VII, p. 76. 4 *Krishnaswami Aiyangar Com. Vol.*, pp. 122-126. 5 Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Numismatic Society of India, 1935, p. 8. Dr. Jayaswal states that his analysis of a Pāṭaliputra coin showed that it was composed of over 74% of copper, and the rest was iron and lead. The *Arthaśāstra* says पादःकोषे ताम्ररूपम् (p. 84) i. e. the copper coins shall contain one-fourth alloy.

the Moon-on-hill.[1] Considering all these factors, we feel sure that we are justified in assigning fourth century B. C. to the *Arthaśāstra*. Full references from the *Arthaśāstra* have been given in the foot-notes in support of our statements. It is hoped that the similarities in the social conditions as presented by the *Arthaśāstra* and by Bhāsa show them to be closely allied in time. Especially in olden times it was extremely difficult to know the exact social life. So our poet must be taken to belong at least to the Mauryan period.

---

1 Proceedings, pp. 11-12; Kautilya's *Arthaśāstra*, p. 84— रूपदर्शकः पणवाद्यां स्थावहारिकीं कोशप्रवेश्यां च स्थापयेत्। रूपिकमष्टकं शतं..... The fee for examining the 'currency-worthiness' (*kośapraveśya*) of the coins was 8%. cf. also 'naremdrāśika' in कृतनरेन्द्राङ्कं शस्त्रावरणमायुधागारं प्रवेशयेत्। at p. 249 and 'rājāṅka' in परपक्षजां राजाङ्केन परिवर्तयिता कथन्वं पूर्वं साहसदण्डं दद्यात्। at p. 129 of the *Arthaśāstra*.

CHAPTER X.

GEOGRAPHICAL KNOWLEDGE.

In this chapter we have grouped in an alphabetical order under different headings, such as countries, towns, mountains and rivers, all the references showing geographical knowledge of the period that we could come across in the works of Bhāsa. In the notes appended to every place name, not only have the identifications of the various places been given, but references to them in the Vedic literature, the epics and the Buddhist works have also been stated as well as some important and interesting historical facts concerning some of these places, bringing the story down to the period of our plays. No references have been made to the subsequent epochs. Among the ancient works, it is to be noted that Pāṇini also supplies us with exact and accurate particulars as to the geographical knowledge of his period.[1] We have liberally drawn on the writing of Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, Sir A. Cunningham, Mr. Nandolal Dey, Dr. B. C. Law, Dr. S. N. Majumdar Sastri, Dr. H. C. Ray Chaudhury and others, and have consulted various other sources.[2] Our indebtedness has been indicated in the foot-notes at suitable places.

The following is the list of the countries, towns, mountains and rivers mentioned by Bhāsa :

COUNTRIES.

Aṅga, Avanti, Uttarakuru, Kāmboja, Kāśi,

---

1 cf. Kunte, *Vicissitudes*, pp. 371-376. 2 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.*, 1918; Cunningham, *Anc. Geography*; Dey, *Geog. Dict.*; Law, *Geog. of Early Buddhism*; Majumdar Sastri, *Cunningham's Anc. Geog.*; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. of Anc. India*; also, Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*; Vaidya, *Upasaṁhāra*; etc.

Kuntibhoja, Kuru, Kurujāṅgala, Kośala, Gāndhāra, Janasthāna, Dakṣiṇāpatha, Magadha, Matsya, Madra, Mithilā, Laṅkā, Vaṅga, Vatsa, Videha, Śūrasena, Saurāṣṭra, and Sauvīra.

TOWNS.

Ayodhyā, Avanti, Kāmpilya, Kiṣkindhā, Kauśāmbī, Pāṭaliputra, Mathurā, Rājagṛha, Laṅkā, Virāṭanagara, Vairantya, Śṛṅgiverapura and Hastināpura.

MOUNTAINS.

Krauñcaparvata, Trikūṭa, Mandara, Malayagiri, Mahendra, Meru, Vindhya, Suvela and Himālaya.

RIVERS.

Gaṅgā, Narmadā and Yamunā.

MINOR PLACES.

Udyāmaka, Yūpagrāma, Nāgavana, Madayantikā, Veṇuvana, Lāvāṇaka, etc.

Aṅga.[1] Aṅga was included in the sixteen ***mahājanapadas*** in ancient India both in the Buddhist and Jain texts.[2] The earliest reference to Aṇga is found in the Atharvaveda[3] The country lies to the East of Magadha separated by river Campā (modern Cāndan). At one time it included Magadha and extended its limits to the shores of the Bay of Bengal. Aṅga corresponds to the modern districts of Monghyr and Bhagalpore. Sir George Birdwood, however, includes, in addition, the districts of Birbhum and Murshidabad. The ***Mahābhārata*** mentions the Aṅga and Vaṅga as forming one kingdom.[4] The country was so named because Madana was burnt here, and hence Madana is known as Anaṅga.[5] It was the kingdom of Romapāda of the ***Rāmāyaṇa*** and Karṇa of the ***Mahābhārata***.

In the epic period, the Aryans of Bengal (Aṅga Vaṅga and Kaliṅga) were looked as of mixed origin and a Brāhmaṇa was considered to lose his status and render

---

1 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.*, pp. 49-73; Dey, *Geog. Dict.*, p. 7; Law, *Geog. Early Bud.*, pp. 6-8; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 2nd Edn., pp. 67-69, 3rd Edn., pp. 75-76. 2 *Aṅguttara, Nikāya*, I. 4; *Vinaya Texts*, II. 146; *Bhagavati Sutra*. 3 *AV*, V. 22, 14. 4 *Sabhāparva*, 44, 9. मगधाविषयाश्चैव.....। 5 *Rāmāyaṇa*, I. 23, 13, 14.

himself liable to be called a *patita* by staying in this region.[1] So, probably the province was supposed to be outside the Bharatakhaṇḍa at the time of the *Mahābhārata*. Before Buddha's time, Aṅga was a powerful kingdom. Aṅga and Magadha were constantly at war, and in Buddha's time the destruction of the Aṅga kingdom was finally effected by Seniya Bimbisāra who killed Brahmadatta, the king of Aṅga, annexed the country and made Campā, the capital of Aṅga kingdom his headquarters, where he stayed as viceroy till his father's death.[2] The fact that in later Buddhist literature we find Aṅga mentioned jointly with Magadha in Dvandva compound *(Aṅga-Magadhā)* shows that it gradually lost its importance and individuality. Aṅga was a prosperous country containing many merchants who had trade relations with a number of countries, and caravans full of merchandise used to pass between Aṅga and Sindhu-Sauvīra.

Its capital was Campā which stood on the Ganges and river Campā (modern Cāndan) at a distance of sixty *yojanas* from Mithilā. It was one of the six great cities in ancient India, the other five being Benares, Kauśāmbī, Rājagṛha, Sāketa and Śrāvasti. Cunningham has identified ancient Campā with two villages, Campanagara and Campapura, near Bhagalpore.[3]

Avanti.[4] Avanti which has been mentioned by Pāṇini (IV. 1. 176) was also one of the sixteen political divisions of India mentioned by Buddhist writers. The name applies to the country as well as to its capital, which is also known as Ujjayinī. The country roughly corresponds to modern Malwa, Nimar and the adjoining parts of the Central Provinces. It was divided into two parts, the Northern, having its capital at Ujjain, and the Southern, with its capital at Māhissatī or Māhiṣmatī, which is usually identified with Māndhātā on the Narmadā.[5] The identification is doubtful according to

---

1 cf. Vaidya, *Upasaṁhāra*, p. 372; *Mbh*, I. 104. 2 cf. *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*; 3rd Edn., p. 78. 3 cf. *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 2nd Edn., p. 68. 4 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.* pp. 53, 54, 57, 64-65; Dey, *Geog. Dict.*, p. 13; Law, *Geog. Early Bud.* pp. 22-23; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 2nd Edn., p. 92, 3rd Edn. pp. 102-103. 5 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.*, p. 54, also under 'Māhissatī' in the Index. Law, *Geog. Early Bud.* p. 22.

Dr. Ray Chaudhury.[1] The foundation of Māhiṣmatī, Avanti, and Vidarbha has been attributed to the scions of the Yadu family in the *Purāṇas*. The famous king Vikramāditya, the hero of a number of legends, is said to have ruled over Avanti. At the time of the Pāṇḍavas, Vinda and Anuvinda, two brothers ruled this country which extended to the banks of the Narmadā towards the South and to the banks of the Mahānadī towards the West.

Avanti was one of the four kingdoms when Buddha lived and preached, the other three being Magadha, Kośala and Vatsa. King Caṇḍa Pradyota of Avanti, Bimbisāra and his son Ajātaśatru of Magadha, Pasenadī and his son Viḍūdabha of Kośala, and Udayana of Vatsa were contemporaries of Buddha. Caṇḍa Pradyota (called Pradyota Mahāsena by Bhāsa) was, as we know, the father of Vāsavadattā, Gopālaka and Anupālaka (*Pratijñā*, II. 13.) and the father-in-law of Udayana Vatsarāja of Kauśāmbī. The terror of the intended invasion of Magadha by Pradyota was the cause of the fortification of Rājagṛha by Ajātaśatru. After Pradyota's death his elder son Gopāla abdicated in favour of his brother Pālaka; but the latter who, as we know from the *Mṛcch*, was a tyrant was ousted by his nephew Āryaka, son of Gopāla, who occupied the throne.[2] The Pradyota dynasty of Avanti was humbled by Śiśunāga and Avanti formed an integral part of the Magadhan Empire in the fourth century B. C. and was an important centre of Buddhism. Called Avanti at least till the second century A. D., the country came to be known as Mālava since the seventh or eighth century A. D.[3]

A short note on Ujjayinī, the capital of Avanti, appears later on in this chapter.

Uttarakuru.[4] Uttarakuru was probably the Kuru country mentioned in the *Ṛgveda*. According to Dey, the Uttarakuru roughly corresponds to the northern portion of Garhwal and Hūṇadeśa on the slopes of the Himālayas. Originally it included countries beyond the Himālayas. Ptolemy refers to it as Ottorakorra, and

---

1 *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 3rd. Edn., p. 102. 2 cf. Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.* pp. 57, 64–65; Pradhan, *Chronology*, pp. 231–237. 3 Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 28. 4 Dey, *Geog. Dict.*, pp. 213–214; Sarup, *Vision*, p. 123.

Lassen places it to the east of Kashgar. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* speaks of the Uttarakuru as situated in the neighbourhood of the Uttaramadras and states that they had a republican form of government.[1] The *Rāmāyaṇa* would include the eastern Turkistan in the Uttarakuru and the *Mahābhārata* would include Tibet.[2] At the time of the *Mahābhārata* it was also known as Harivarṣa. In the period of the *Brāhmaṇas* and the epics the country occupied a position of great eminence. Its priests were looked on as the most learned, its sacrifices regarded as most perfect, its speech the correct one, its kings the paragons of virtue and duty—in fact, it was an ideal place for human beings. The marriage laws of the Uttarakurus were most lax. From very early times, a mythical character was attached to the country, and its inhabitants and their luxurious mode of living became proverbial. Their life to others was of perfect joy and happiness and was regarded as a life in heaven. Pāli literature alludes to the country as a mythical region. Kashmir or Tibet may be taken to have represented the Uttarakurus of the ancient days.

The capital of the Uttarakuru is not yet known.[4]

Kāmboja.[5] Kāmboja mentioned by Pāṇini (IV. I. 175) was one of the sixteen *mahājanapadas*. It corresponds, according to Dey, to the northern part of Afghanistan, while Dr. Stein takes the eastern part of Afghanistan to represent Kāmboja.[6] It is constantly associated with Gāndhāra and hence Ray Chaudhury rightly locates it near Gāndhāra.[7] One view associates the Kāmbojas with a north Himalayan people, while another associates them with the Tibetans.[8] From ancient times the country is celebrated for horses and Bhāsa also refers to this feature of the country.[9] Dr. Rhys Davids states the capital of this country to be Dvārakā.[10] No mention is made in the Vedic texts of any king of Kāmboja, but a teacher named Kāmboja Aupamanyava, probably connected with this territory is referred to in the *Vaṁśa*

---

1 *Ait. Brā.* VIII. 14. 2 *Rāmāyaṇa.* V. 43 ; *Mbh,* VI. 7. 3 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.*, p. 52. 4 Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.* p. 683 ; Dey, *Geog. Dict.*, p. 87 ; Law, *Geog. Early Ind.* pp. 50-51 ; Ray Chaudhury, (*Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*) 2nd Edn. p. 94 sq. 5 Dey, *Geog. Dict.*, p. 87. 6 *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 2nd Edn. p. 94. 7 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.* pp. 54-55. 8 cf. *Karṇa*, St. 18, 19. 9 *Buddhist India*, p. 28.

Brāhmaṇa.[1] It appears from the Buddhist accounts that the caste system and the *Āśramadharma* had not got a stronghold in Kāmboja in Buddhist period. The capital of Kāmboja is not yet known.

Kāśi.[2] Kāśī was included in the *mahājanapadas* by both the Buddhist and Jain writers. Though applied to the country and its capital (known as Bārāṇasī) it properly represents the country which was three hundred leagues in extent.

The earliest reference to Kāśī as a tribe is found in the Paippalāda recension of the *Atharvaveda*. Kāśī was a great political power before Buddha's time and probably played a prominent part in the subversion of the Videhan monarchy.[3] In the Brāhmaṇa period, Dhṛtarāṣṭra, a king of Kāśī, attempted to perform the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice, but was defeated by Sātrājita Śatānīka who took away his sacrificial horse, and consequently the Kāśis gave up the kindling of the sacred fire down to the period of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*.[4] The *Mahābhārata* speaks of Pratardana, a king of Kāśī, to have crushed the power of Vītahavyas or Haihayas.[5] The *Jātakas* and the *Mahāvagga* refer to the annexation of the Kośala kingdom by the Brahmadattas of Kāśī.[6] Fierce battles were constantly waged between Kāśī and Kośala in which sometimes Kāśī won and sometimes the Kośalas. At the time of Buddha, the Kāśī kingdom was annexed to the kingdom of Kośala. The term "*Kāsī-Kośalā*" current with regard to the country, like the compound "*Aṅga-Magadhā*" referred to earlier, speaks of the loss of independence of Kāśī. Prasenajit of Kośala and Ajātaśatru of Magadha engaged in fierce battle for the possession of Kāśī, in which Ajātaśatru won in the end incorporating Kāśī into the Magadha kingdom.

Bārāṇasī (modern Benares) the capital of the state, the most important city in ancient India, was

---

1 *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 1st Edn. p. 77. 2 Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.* p. 499; Dey, *Geog. Dict.*, p. 95; Law, *Geog. Early Buddhism*, pp. 3–4; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 2nd. Edn. pp. 44–46. 3 cf. Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 1st Edn., p. 46. 4 *Śat Brā.* XIII. 54-4-19. Also *Ait. Brā.* 5 *Mbh*, XIII. 30. 6 *Kosāmbī Jā.* (No. 428); *Kusāla Jā* (No. 536) *Mahāvagga*, SBE, Vol. XIII. pp. 294–299. Dr. Bhandarkar (*Carm. Lect.*, p. 56) has proved that Brahmadatta was the name of a family and not of any particular king.

twelve yojanas in extent.[1] The city was so named as it was situated at the confluence of the rivers Barna and Asi. Formerly it was situated at the junction of the Ganges and the Gomti. Princep states that Benares was founded by Kāśa or Kāśirāja, a descendant of Purūravas, king of Pratiṣṭhāna.[2] In the reign of Divodāsa, a scion of Kāśirāja, Buddhism superseded Śaivism which in its turn superseded the former. In the Buddhist world Benares was a place of pilgrimage. The great Buddha spent a great part of his life at Benares. The city was a great centre of trade and industry. Dr. Bhandarkar enumerates Surundhana, Sudassana, Brahmavaddhana, Pupphāvatī, Ramma city and Molini as the alternative names of Bārāṇasī.[3]

Kuntibhoja.[4] Kuntibhoja, according to Dey, was also called Bhoja and was an ancient town of Mālava where Kunti was brought up. It was situated on the bank of a small river called Aśvanadī or Aśvarathanadī which falls into the river Cambal. From references in the *Avimāraka* it appears that the country of the Kuntibhojas has been alluded to. The country stood at the time of the *Mahābhārata*, on the river Carmaṇvatī and roughly corresponded to a region in the Gwalior State. There is at present a place in the State known as Kuntibhojapura and hence the identification appears to be correct according to Vaidya.[5]

The capital of the ancient country was Vairantya, about which a note appears later on.

Kuru.[6] The Kuru country, as already stated, is mentioned in the *Ṛgveda*. It is one of the sixteen *mahājanapadas* in the Buddhist works. The kingdom of Kuru extended, according to Majumdar Sastri, from the Saraswatī to the Ganges and its southern boundary was Khāṇḍava.[7] Roughly speaking, the Kuru kingdom corresponded to modern Thanesar, Delhi and the Upper Doab. The rivers Hiraṇvatī, Kauśikī Aruṇā, Apayā, Pastyā, Sarasvatī and Dṛṣadvatī flowed within the kingdom.[8]

---

1 *Jā.* VI, p. 160. 2 *Benares Illustrated*, Intr., p. 8. 3 *Carm. Lect.* pp. 50-51. 4 Dey, *Geog. Dict.*, p. 109. 5 *Upasaṁhāra*, p. 373. 6 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.*, p. 52, Cunningham *Anc. Geog.* pp. 701-702; Dey, *Geog. Dict.*, pp. 74-110; Law, *Geog. Early Buddhism*, pp. 17-18; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 2nd. Edn. pp. 11, 12, 29, 84. 7 *Cunningham's Anc. Geog.* p. 701. 8 Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.* 2nd Edn., p. 12.

It was divided into three parts, Kurukṣetra, the Kurus and Kurujāṅgala (which will be dealt with in the next note). Kurukṣetra corresponds to the Thanesar district which formerly included Sonpat, Panipat, Amin and Karnal, and was situated between the river Sarasvatī on the north and Dṛṣadvatī on the south. It was at Amin (contraction of Abhimanyukṣetra according to Cunningham) five miles south of Thanesar that Abhimanyu was killed and Aśvatthāman defeated by Arjuna.[1] The capital of the kingdom in the Vedic age was Āsandīvat, probably identical with Hastināpura, about which a note appears later on. Samantapañcaka, mentioned in the *Ūrubhaṅga* of our plays, where the great Kuru battle was fought, was "the place in Kurukṣetra where Paraśurāma (Rāma with the axe) is said to have slain the Kṣatriya race."

Kurujāṅgala.[2] Kurujāṅgala, as stated in the previous note, was a part of the Kuru kingdom, and as its name signifies, was a forest tract. It was a forest country situated in Sirhind, to the north-west of Hastināpura. It was called Śrīkaṇṭhadeśa in the Buddhist period and its capital was Bilaspur.

Kośala.[3] Kośala is included in the list of *mahājanapadas* by both the Buddhist and Jain works and is also mentioned by Pāṇini. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* refers to the Kośalas as falling under the influence of Brahmanical culture later than the Kurupāñcālas and earlier than the Videhas. The kingdom of Kośala was bounded on the west by Pāñcāla, on the south by the rivers Syandikā and Sarpikā, on the east by the Sadānīrā beyond which lay the Videha country, and on the north by the Nepal hills. It roughly corresponds to modern Oudh.

It was divided into two kingdoms, north-Kośala (which corresponded with the modern Bahraich district), and Kośala. At the time of Buddha, Kośala was a powerful kingdom which included the Kāśīs and the Śākyas. It was ruled over by king Prasenajit (Pasenadī) of the celebrated Ikṣvāku family. He had

1 Dey, *Geog. Dict.* p. 110. 2 Woolner and Sarup, *Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, Vol. 2, p. 45n 1. 3 Dey, *Geog. Dict.* p. 110. 4 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.* pp. 51, 57–58, 65–67; Dey, *Geog. Dict.* pp. 14, 103; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.* 2nd Edn. pp. 62–63.

matrimonial alliances with Magadha and the Śākyas. The Śākyas practised a trick on Pasenadī in that he was given a girl of impure blood in marriage, whom, in ignorance, the king raised to the position of a chief queen. Viḍūḍabha, the issue of the marriage, was subjected to indignities as the result of his visit to the Śākya countries where he went against his mother's advice, and there he came to know of the real origin of his mother. When Pasenadī learnt of the deceit he degraded both the queen and the prince, but on Buddha's intercession, reinstated them. Viḍūḍabha wreaked a terrible vengeance on coming to the throne by ordering a ferocious massacre of the Śākyas.[1] During Pasenadī's absence, Dīghacārāyaṇa, the commander-in-chief, raised prince Viḍūḍabha to the throne. Pasenadī set out for Rājagṛha to get help from his nephew Ajātaśatru, but died from exposure outside the gates of Rājagṛha. There were wars between Kośala and Magadha, and finally Kośala was absorbed into the Magadha kingdom.

The Vedic texts do not mention any city in Kośala. Ayodhyā on the bank of the Sarayu was the capital of Kośala according to the Rāmāyaṇa. Kuśavatī, founded by Kuśa was once the capital of a part of the kingdom. Śrāvasti or Sāvatthī was the capital in Buddha's time and it has been identified with the great ruined city Maheth, on the south bank of the Rāptī, situated on the borders of the Gonda and Bahraich districts of the U. P. Sāketa, identified by Cunningham with Ayodhyā, was an important town in the kingdom and was its capital in the period immediately preceding Buddha.[2] Ayodhyā seems to be the earliest capital, Sāketa the next, and Śrāvasti was the last capital. Sāketa and Śrāvasti were included among the six great cities of ancient India.

Gāndhāra.[3] The king and the people of Gāndhāra are mentioned in the *Ṛgveda* and the *Atharvaveda*.[4] It is included in the sixteen *mahājanapadas* in the Buddhist literature. The country lies on both sides of the Indus

1 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.* pp. 66–67. 2 Bhandarkar. *Carm. Lect.*, p. 51; Cunningham, *ASR*, I, p. 320. As regards the identity of Sāketa and Ayodhyā, Prof. Rhys Davids points out that both cities are mentioned as existing in Buddha's time (*Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.* 1st Edn., p. 49). 3 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.* pp. 48, 54; Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.* pp. 55–56; Dey, *Geog. Dict.* pp. 60–61; Law, *Geog. Early Bud.* pp. 49–50; Ray Chaudhury *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.* 2nd Edn. pp. 33, 93; 3rd Edn. pp. 103, 104. 4 *Ṛgveda* I. 126. 7; *Atharvaveda* V, 22, 14.

comprising the districts of Peshawar of the North-Western Frontier and Rawalpindi in the northern Punjab; it included West Punjab and East Afghanistan according to Dr. Bhandarkar.[1] Ptolemy, however, states the Indus to be the western boundary of Gandari. *Jātaka* No. 406 indicates Gāndhāra to have included also Kashmir and Takṣaśilā. According to the *Purāṇas* the kings of Gāndhāra were the descendants of Druhyu. King Pukkusāti who ruled over Gāndhāra in the sixth century B. C. is said to have sent an embassy to Bimbisāra, king of Magadha, and to have defeated king Pradyota of Avanti. Gāndhāra was conquered by the king of Persia in the latter half of the sixth century B. C. In the Behistun inscription of Darius, Gāndhāras appear among the subject people of the Achæmenidan Empire.[2] In the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Puṣkarāvatī (or Puṣkalāvatī) the most ancient capital of Gāndhāra has been placed in Gandharvadeśa, and the *Kathāsaritsāgara* calls Puṣkarāvata the capital of the Vidyādharas. It is not unlikely that the name Gāndhāra as found in the *Mahābhārata* and in the Buddhist works is a corruption of Gandharvadeśa of Vālmīki.

It had two capitals, Puruṣapura, which is now called Peshawar, and Takṣaśilā, the Taxila of the Greek historians. Though apparently mentioned as a despised people in the *Atharvaveda*, Gāndhāra became the resort of scholars of all classes who flocked to Takṣaśilā for instructions in three Vedas and sixteen branches of knowledge.[3] Pāṇini, a native of Gāndhāra refers to Takṣaśilā in IV. 3. 93. Puṣkarāvatī or Puṣkalāvatī was another great city which is represented by the modern Prang and Charsadda, seventeen miles north-east of Peshawar on the Swat river.[4]

Janasthāna.[5] Janasthāna corresponds roughly to the district of Aurangabad in Nizam's Dominions and the country between the rivers Godāvarī and Kṛṣṇā. Pañcavaṭī or Nasik was included in Janasthāna. Janasthāna formed part of the Daṇḍakāraṇya of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. According to Pargiter, it lay on both the banks of the

1 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.* p. 54. 2 Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 3rd Edn., p. 104. 3 cf. *Śat. Brā.* XI. 4. 1. 1. et seq; *Kaus. Up.* VII. 6; *Chāndogya Up.*; for the Buddhist Period, cf. R. Mookerji, *Visvabhārati Qtly.* Oct. 1923, pp. 228-229. 4 Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.* 1st Edn., p. 24. 5 Dey, *Geog. Dict.*, p. 80.

Godāvarī and was probably the country around the junction of Godāvarī with Vainagaṅgā.

Dakṣiṇāpatha.[1] Though not strictly referring to any particular country, Dakṣiṇāpatha in ancient times signified the region to the South. The expression "*dakṣiṇā padā*" occurring in *Ṛgveda* X. 61.8 with reference to the place where the exile has been expelled does not, in the opinion of Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, denote Dakṣiṇāpatha or Southern India as we understand it, but simply "the South" beyond the limits of the recognized Aryan world.[2] Pāṇini uses the word '*Dākṣiṇātya*' and Baudhāyana refers to '*Dakṣiṇāpatha*' coupled with '*Saurāṣṭra*'; but it is not clear what either exactly meant by '*Dākṣiṇātya*' or '*Dakṣiṇāpatha*'.[3] Pāṇini, however, mentions no province south of the Narmadā except Aśmaka.[4] Whatever be the correct meaning of those terms, it is certain that in the period of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, the Aryans had crossed the Vindyas and had come in contact with several states in the Deccan including Vidarbha or Berar. Vidarbha existed as an independent kingdom in the time of Nimi king of Videha, and Nimi and Nagnajit king of Gāndhāra, and Bhīma king of Vidarbha were contemporaries of Karaṇḍu of Kaliṅga, showing that the kingdom of Kaliṅga existed in the Brāhmaṇa period.[5] Ancient Kaliṅga comprised modern Orissa to the south of the Vaitaraṇī and the sea-coast southward as far as Vizagapatam.[6] The Aryan kingdoms in the south comprised of the Bhojas, the Ailas and the Ikṣvākus occupying Vidarbha, Kaliṅga, Aśmaka and Daṇḍaka. The whole of the remaining part of the trans-Vindhyan India was occupied by non-Aryan tribes such as the Āndhras, Puṇḍras, Śabaras, Pulindas and Mūtibas. The Aryan route to the South lay through Avanti to the Vindyas and then through Vidarbha and Mūlaka to Aśmaka, and from there to Madura through the Raichur and Chitaldrug districts.[7] Dakṣiṇāpatha thus means the Deccan, *i. e.*, the territory lying south of the Narmadā. The Greeks called it by the name Dakhinabades.

---

1 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.*, pp. 2-23; Dey, *Geog. Dict.* p. 52; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.* 2nd Edn. pp. 53-54. 2 *Carm. Lect.*, p. 2. 3 *Pāṇini*, IV. 2. 98; *Baudhāyana Sūtra*, I. 1. 29. 4 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect*, p. 4. 5 *Ait. Brā*, VII. 34-9; *Kumbhakāra Jātaka*; Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.* pp. 2-3; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 1st Edn. p. 41. 6 *Cunningham's Anc. Geog.* p. 735n. 7 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.*, pp. 22-23.

Kuṇḍina, the capital of Vidarbha corresponds to the modern Kauṇḍinyapura on the banks of the Wardha in the Chandur Taluk of Amraoti.[1] Dantapuranagara was the capital of Kaliṅga, and Potana that of Assaka.[2] The river Telavāha on which Andhapura, the capital of the Āndhras is stated to be situated, has been identified by Dr. Bhandarkar with either the Tel or Telingiri flowing near each other not far from the confines of the C. P. and Madras.[3] Pulindanagara, the capital of the Pulindas, lay to the south-east of Daśārṇa, the Vidiśā or Bhilsa region.[4]

Magadha.[5] Magadha appears in the list of *mahājanapadas* of the Buddhist and Jain writers. Earliest reference to Magadha is found in the *Atharvaveda*.[6] The people of Magadha are spoken in terms of contempt in the early Vedic literature. The Vedic dislike of the Magadhas, as Oldenberg thinks, was in all probability due to the fact that the Magadhas were not wholly Brahmanized.[7] Magadha roughly corresponds to Patna and Gaya districts of Bihar, which are still called by the name Maga, corruption of Magadha.[8] It once extended south of the Ganges from Benares to Monghyr and southward as far as Singhbhum. The kingdom was established by Vasu, son of Kuśa; the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*, however, mention Bṛhadratha, son of Vasu Caidyoparicara and father of Jarāsandha as the founder of the earliest dynasty of Magadha.[9] The Bārhadratha dynasty had come to an end before Buddha's time.

Girivraja, also known as Rājagṛha, was the ancient capital of Magadha, which was subsequently removed to Pāṭaliputra. Short notes appear on both the cities later on in this chapter.

Magadha was an important political and commercial centre and people from all parts of Northern India flocked to the country for commerce. The second Magadhan

---

1 Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 1st Edn. p. 41. 2 Ray Chaudhury, *op. cit*, p. 42. 3 *Id*, 1918, p. 71; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 1st Edn. p. 44. 4 Ray Chaudhury, *op. cit*, p. 44. 5 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.* pp. 39, 40, 48-50, 56, 57, etc., Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.* pp. 6, 518; Dey, *Geog. Dict.*, pp. 116-117; Law, *Geog. Early Bud.* pp. 8-11; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 3rd Edn, pp. 78, 79. 6 *Atharvaveda*, V. 22. 14; cf. Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect*, p. 50. 7 Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 400n; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 1st Edn. p. 57. 8 Dey, *Geog. Dict.* p. 117. 9 *Rāmāyaṇa*, I. 32. 7; *Mahābhārata*, I. 63. 30.

dynasty, according to the *Purāṇas*, was the Śaiśunāga dynasty founded by king Śiśunāga. Magadha formed friendly relations with its neighbouring countries in the north and the west by marriages and other alliances. In Buddha's time, Bimbisāra ruled over Magadha. He embraced Buddhism and helped much in the spread of that religion in the country. He built many Vihāras for the Buddhists. His son Ajātaśatru imprisoned him and usurped the throne. He transferred the old capital from Rājagṛha to Pāṭaliputra. Though antagonistic to Buddhism at first, he accepted the doctrines later on and built a large mandap for the Buddhists near his capital. Aṅga and Vajjis were under the suzerainty of Magadha.

Matsya.[1] Matsya formed one of the sixteen *mahājanapadas* in the Buddhist literature. According to Dr. Bhandarkar, Matsya originally included parts of Alwar, Jaipur and Bharatpur. But, as stated by Dr. Ray Chaudhury, " Alwar seems to have been the territory of a neighbouring people—the Śālvas";[2] Dr. Law and Mr. Dey, however, include Alwar in the Matsya country.[3] Maccheri, corruption of Matsya, is situated twenty-two miles south of Alwar. Matsyas first appear in the *Ṛgveda* (VII. 18. 6) as the enemies of Sudāsa. They are also mentioned in the *Śatapatha* and *Gopatha Brāhmaṇas* and the *Kauśitaki Upaniṣad*.[4] It was the kingdom of Virāṭa where the Pāṇḍavas stayed for one year *incognito*. Monarchical system of government seems to have prevailed in Matsya till the loss of its independence as its name does not appear in the list given by Kauṭilya of states having a *saṁgha* form of government.[5]

Mr. Dey gives two other Matsya countries which corresponded with (1) Coorg and (2) the southern portion of Tirhut;[6] but Bhāsa has referred to the Matsya country occupied by Virāṭa.

---

1 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect*, pp. 52-53; Cunningham, *Anc. Geog*, pp. 387, 391, 702. Dey, *Geog. Dict*, pp. 128, 129; Law, *Geog. Early Bud*, p. 20; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 3rd Edn, pp. 44-45, 96. 2 *Carm. Lect*, p. 53; *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 3rd Edn, pp. 44, 45. In a foot-note on p. 39 of the 2nd Edn. of the *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, Dr. Ray Chaudhury has referred to Dey (*Geog. Dict*, 1st Edn, p. ii) to be in his favour. It appears that Dey has changed his view, (*op. cit*, 2nd Edn, p. 128). 3 Dey, *Geog. Dict*, p. 128; Law, *Geog. Early Bud*, p. 19. 4 *Śat. Brāh*, XIII. 5. 4. 9; *Gopatha Brā*, I. 2. 9; *Kauśitaki Up*, IV. 5 Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 3rd Edn, p. 96. 6 *Geog. Dict*, pp. 128-129.

Pargiter thinks its capital was Upaplavya, at a distance of two days' journey by chariot from Hastināpura; but according to Nīlakaṇṭha's commentary on the *Mahābhārata*, Upaplavya was a city near Virāṭanagara.[1] Virāṭanagara was the capital of the Matsya country and a short note appears thereon later in this chapter.

Madra.[2] Madra was a country in the Punjab between the Ravi and the Chinaub. Some take it to have extended from the Bias to the Jhelum. Dr. Ray Chaudhury states the country to have been divided into two parts—Northern and Southern. Northern Madra was beyond the Himavat range, near the Uttarakurus, probably in Kashmir. Southern Madra, or the Madra proper, was in the central Punjab, roughly corresponding with modern Sialkot and the neighbouring districts.[3] Madra was the kingdom of Śalya, the maternal uncle of the Pāṇḍavas.

Modern Sialkot, which is the corrupt form of Kot (fort) of Śalya, was its capital, which was known in those days as Śākala.

Mithilā.[4] Mithilā was another name for Videha, though the capital of Videha was also known as Mithilā. During the *Brāhmaṇa* period Mithilā had a monarchical constitution.[5] According to the *Rāmāyaṇa* the royal family of Mithilā was founded by Nimi. Janaka was the son of Mithi who was Nimi's son. The *Jātakas* state that the Videha kingdom measured three hundred leagues and consisted of sixteen thousand villages.[6] Karāla Janaka was the Videha king whose lascivious conduct brought his line to an end, the overthrow of the monarchy being followed by the rise of a republic—the Vajjian confederacy. Thus, in Buddha's time, Videha country was one of the eight constituent principalities of the Vajjian confederacy, which constituted one of the sixteen *mahājanapadas* mentioned both by the Jain and Buddhist writers. The kingdom of Videha over which Janaka, father of Sītā ruled, roughly corresponds to modern Tirhut in Bihar. Its western boundary was the Sadānīrā which

1 Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 3rd Edn. p. 45. 2 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect*, p. 186; Cunningham, *Anc. Geog*, pp. 212, 686; Dey, *Geog. Dict*, p. 116; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 2nd Edn. p. 37. 3 *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 2nd Edn. p. 37. 4 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect*, p. 50; Cunningham, *Anc. Geog*, pp. 509, 510, 716; Dey, *Geog. Dict*, p. 35; Law, *Geog. Early Bud*, pp. 30-31; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 2nd Edn, pp. 38, 74. 5 Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 1st Edn. pp. 20-23. 6 *Jā*. 406, 489.

cannot be the modern Gaṇḍaka as the *Mahābhārata* mentions both rivers side by side; so Pargiter's identification of the Sadānīrā with the Rāptī seems to be correct.[1]

Janakapura or Mithilā was the capital of Videha. It has been identified with Janakpur, a small town within the Nepal border, to the north of which Muzaffarpur and Darbhanga districts meet.[2] According to Mr. Dey, Benares afterwards became the capital of Videha.

Laṅkā.[3] Laṅkā has variously been identified with some places in the central India, in Egypt or with Ceylon. Mr. Dey has mentioned some good reasons to suppose that Laṅkā and Ceylon are not identical. Some *Purāṇas* mention Laṅkā and Siṁhala as distinct, and Varāhamihira says that Laṅkā and Ujjayinī are situated on the same meridian, while Ceylon lies far to the east of this meridian. The *Rāmāyaṇa* suggests that Laṅkā was to the south of the Cardamum mountains and that one must cross the Tāmraparṇī to reach Laṅkā; whereas one is not required to cross the Tāmraparṇī to reach the island by Adam's Bridge. Many writers, on the other hand, confirm the ancient tradition from which it appears that the modern Ceylon corresponds with Laṅkā. The *Mahāvaṁśa* distinctly states that the island of Laṅkā was called Siṁhala by Vijaya after his conquest. Dharmakīrti, the author of *Dathāvaṁśa* says that Siṁhala and Laṅkā are the same islands, and the *Rājāvali* mentions the tradition of the war of Rāvaṇa in Ceylon.

The name of the capital was also Laṅkā which was a town in Ceylon.

Vaṅga.[4] The name Vaṅga first occurs in the *Aitareya Āraṇyaka* of the *Ṛgveda*. It is also referred to repeatedly in the epics and other Sanskrit works. Dr. Bhau Daji identified Vaṅga with the country between the Brahmaputrā and the Padmā. According to Majumdar Sastri, Vaṅga is bounded on the west by the Brahmaputrā, on the south by the Ganges, on the east by the Meghna and on the north by the Khasi hills. Pargiter states that Vaṅga must have comprised the modern districts of Murshidabad, Nadia, Jessore, parts of Rajashahi, Pabna and Faridpur.

---

1 Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 2nd Edn, p. 28. 2 Cunningham, *Anc. Geog*, p. 718. 3 *Geog. Dict*, p. 85. 4 Dey, *Geog. Dict*, pp. 113-114. 5 Cunningham, *Anc. Geog*, p. 780; Dey, *Geog. Dict*, p. 92.

As already stated, in the period of the *Mahābhārata*, the residents of Vaṅga (along with Aṅga, Kaliṅga, Puṇḍra and Suhma) were regarded as of mixed origin and the Brāhmaṇas were prohibited from residing in the country.

Vatsa.[1] Vatsa is included among the sixteen *mahājanapadas* both by the Jain and Buddhist writers. Oldenberg seems inclined to identify the Vaṁśas (Vatsas) with the Vaśas of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*; but, in the opinion of Dr. Ray Chaudhury, "the conjecture lacks proof".[2] Majumdar Sastri, however, derives Vaṁśa from Vaśa, which he takes to be the old Vedic form of Vatsa.[3]

The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* mentions a teacher named Proti Kauśāmbeya, evidently referring to Kauśāmbī, the capital of the Vatsa kingdom.[4]

The Vatsa country has variously been taken to be Rewah district round the Buddhist ruins at Bhārhut, or Bāndā district. It appears to be the region to the west of Allahabad. The Ganges was its northern boundary at the time of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

The earliest king of Kauśāmbī about whom we know anything is Śatānīka II of the Pauranic list. The *Purāṇas* state the name of his father to be Vasudāna, while according to Bhāsa, it was Sahasrānīka. Śatānīka had married a princess of Videha as his son is called Vaidehīputra. He is said to have attacked Campā, the capital of Aṅga, during the reign of Dadhivāhana. The famous Udayana Vatsarāja who was a scion of the celebrated Bharatakula of Vedic renown, and about whom we know so much from Bhāsa's works, was the son and successor of Śatānīka. He married Vāsavadattā, daughter of king Pradyota Mahāsena of Avanti, and Padmāvatī sister of king Darśaka of Magadha. After hearing of the death of Pradyota of Avanti, his father-in-law, Udayana asked his brother-in-law Gopāla who was staying with him, to go to Avanti and rule there. The latter, however, abdicated in favour of his younger brother Pālaka. Udayana was so much grieved at Pradyota's death that he

---

1 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.* pp. 57, 81, 84; Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.* pp. 709–710; Dey, *Geog. Dict.* pp. 28, 96–97; Law, *Geog Early Buddhism*, p. 16; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 2nd Edn, pp. 83–85. 2 Oldenberg, *Buddha*, p. 393n; *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.* 3rd Edn, p. 92. 3 *Cunningham's. Anc. Geog*, p. 710. 4 *Śat. Brā*, XII. 2. 2. 13.

resolved to depart from this world. He placed his son Naravāhanadatta under the charge of Gopāla and proceeded to a precipitous hill with both his queens; ascending the top, all the three killed themselves by falling down. This occurred in 490 B. C., the same year that Pradyota died.[1]

A short note appears later on dealing with Kauśāmbī, the capital of the Vatsa kingdom.

Videha. Videha has already been dealt with under "Mithilā."

Śūrasena. Śūrasena was one of the sixteen *mahājanapadas* mentioned in Buddhist works. There is no reference to Śūrasena or Mathurā (its capital) in the Vedic literature, but Saurasenoi and Methora occur in the Greek accounts. According to the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*, Yadu or Yādava whose tribe is often mentioned in the *Ṛgveda* along with other tribes was the progenitor of the ruling family of Śūrasena.[2] The country received its name from Śūra, the father of Vasudeva and Kunti. According to the *Vāyupurāṇa*, the country was named after Śūrasena, a son of Śatrughna, and later on it passed into the hands of the Yādavas. Śūrasena corresponds to the present district of Muttra with the small states of Bharatpur, Khiraoli and Dholpur, and the northern half of the Gwalior territory.[3] The Śūrasenas continued to be a notable people up to the time of Megasthenes.

Mathurā, the capital of Śūrasena, has been dealt with in a note later on.

Saurāṣṭra.[4] Saurāṣṭra, the Syrastrene of Ptolemy, corresponds to modern Kathiawar and other portions of Gujarat. In the days of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Surāṣṭra represented the country from the Indus to Broach, *i. e.*, Gujarat, Cutch and Kathiawar. According to Hoernle, Saurājya was a synonym of Saurāṣṭra.[5] Saurāṣṭra was included in the Mauryan Empire and was governed by

---

1 Pradhan, *Chronology of India*, p. 246. 2 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.*, pp. 48, 53; Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.*, pp. 427-429, 706; Dey, *Geog. Dict.*, pp. 127-128, 197; Law, *Geog. Early Bud.*, pp. 20-21; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 3rd Edn., pp. 97-100. 3 *Rgveda*, I. 108. 8; also *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 3rd Edn, p. 97. 4 Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.*, pp. 427-428. 5 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.*, pp. 23-24; Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.* pp. 363, 371, 699; Dey, *Geog. Dict.* p. 183; Law, *Geog. Early Bud.*, p. 58. 6 *JASB*, 1873, p. 105.

Satraps under Aśoka and the Mauryan kings. Tradition connects Mādhavapura in Kathiawar with the marriage of Kṛṣṇa with Rukmiṇī, and Prabhāsapaṭṭana (near Veraval) with the death of the Lord. Saurāṣṭra, Surāṣṭra, or Surath is now known as Surat which is a district in Gujarat in Bombay Presidency.

Valabhī was the capital of Surāṣṭra.

Sauvīra.[1] There is an amount of difference of opinion as to the identity of Sauvīra. Cunningham takes Sauvīra to be another name for the province of Badari or Eder at the head of the gulf of Cambay, Southern or South-Western Rajputana.[2] Rhys Davids places Sauvīra to the north of Kathiawar and along the gulf of Cutch.[3] Rapson says that Sindhu and Sauvīra represent the same country and hence Sauvīra corresponds with Sind.[4] According to Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajit, Sindhu is Sind and Sauvīra forms part of Upper Sind. The *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* locates Sindhu and Sauvīra in Northern India along with Gāndhāra, Madra, etc. Nandolal Dey prefers the identification suggested by Alberuni with Multan and Jahrawar.[5] Sauvīra may have been the Sophir or Ophir of the Bible. The country had vast maritime relations with the West and the Bible refers to gold, monkeys and peacocks as having been exported from Ophir.

The inhabitants of Sindhu-Sauvīra along with those of Avanti and Magadha have been referred to by Baudhāyana as outside Āryāvarta and of mixed origin; some sin was attached for those contracting marital relations with these people. In Bhāsa, on the contrary, we find all the three countries occupying the same position as the other countries in Āryāvarta.[6] Roruka is said to have been the capital of Sauvīra.

CITIES.

Ayodhyā. Ayodhyā was in Kośala which corresponds to modern Oudh. Kośala as already stated was one of the sixteen *mahājanapadas* mentioned by the

1 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.* p. 24. Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.* pp. 569, 570, 643; Dey, *Geog. Dict.* p. 183; Law, *Geog. Early Buddhism*, p. 58. 2 *Anc. Geog.* pp. 569, 570, 643. 3 *Bud. Ind.* p. 321. 4 *Anc. Ind.* p. 168. 5 *Geog. Dict.* p. 183. 6 Baudh. Śā. I. 1. 2. 13; cf. Bhide, *Svapna*, Intr., p. 16.

Buddhist and Jain writers. During Buddha's time, the province was divided into Uttara Kośala and Dakṣiṇa Kośala, the river Sarayu serving as a dividing line. The capital of Northern Kośala, as previously stated, was Śrāvasti on the Rāptī, and Ayodhyā on the Sarayu was the capital of Southern Kośala. Ayodhyā was also the capital of the Solar kings of the Raghu line. It is said to have extended forty eight miles in length and twelve miles in breadth. Nandigrāma was one of its suburbs, wherefrom Bharata governed the kingdom in Rāma's absence. Ayodhyā, as is well known, plays an important part in the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Regarding the identification of Sāketa and Ayodhyā, Rhys Davids has pointed out that both cities existed in Buddha's time; it is not unlikely that both were adjoining cities like London and Westminster.[1] Ayodhyā occupies a premier place among the seven sacred cities of the Hindus reputed to confer final beatitude on those leaving their mortal coil at any one of those cities.[2] In Buddha's time, Ayodhyā had sunk to the level of an unimportant town.[3] It was not included in the six great cities of ancient India.

Avanti.[4] Avanti (or Ujjayinī) was the capital of the country of that name. It is said to have been founded by the scions of the Yadu family. Ujjayinī was situated on the river Siprā and had an area of two miles. The ancient city seems to have existed at a distance of one mile to the south from the present city, as pillars and other remains of buildings are found embedded underground there. There is an ancient temple of Mahākāleśvara at Ujjain. Vinda and Anuvinda ruled here at the time of the Pāṇḍavas and Caṇḍa Pradyota at the time of Buddha. King Aśoka resided here in 263 B. C. as his father's viceroy and Mahendra was born to Aśoka at Ujjayinī. At the time of our poet, the public baths at Ujjayinī were wellknown.[5] The city has been known to

1 Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 2nd Edn. p. 63.

2 Cf. अयोध्या मथुरा माया काशी काञ्ची अवन्तिका।
पुरी द्वारावती चैव सप्तैता मोक्षदायकाः॥

3 Rhys Davids, *Bud. Ind*, p. 34. 4 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect*, p. 45; Cunningham, *Anc. Geog*, p. 726; Dey, *Geog. Dict*, pp. 13, 209; Law, *Geog Early Buddhism*, p. 22; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 3rd Edn. pp. 102-103. 5 Cf. *Svapna*, p. 104. —अत्थि पवरी उज्जयणी णाम। तत्थि अट्टिअरमणीआणि उदआहाणाणि वत्तन्ति किल।

be an important trading centre and is mentioned as such in the Buddhist and Sanskrit literature.

Kāmpilya. Kāmpilya corresponds with modern Kampil which is situated twenty eight miles to the north-east of Fathgad in the Farokhabad district in the U. P.[1] It lies on the old Ganges between Budaon and Farokhabad to the north of Kanoj and east of Muttra. Great Pāñcāla king Culanī Brahmadatta is mentioned in *Jātaka* No. 546, the *Uttarādhyayanasūtra* and the *Svapnavāsavadatta*; but the story of Brahmadatta is essentially legendary and little reliance can be placed on it.[2] Kāmpilya was the capital of Drupada, king of South Pāñcāla. North Pāñcāla had Ahicchatra for its capital. Kāmpilya was the scene of the famous Draupadī Svayaṁvara. Kanoj flourished in the regime of Harṣavardhana and as a result Kāmpilya gradually lost its importance. Mahomedans christened it 'Kampil' which is its present name.

Kiṣkindhā.[3] Kiṣkindhā is a small village in Dharwar district on the south bank of the Tuṅgabhadrā near Anagandi. It is a suburb of Vijayanagara and lies near Bellary. It comprises hills lying on the other side of Humpi, consisting of a vast range of naked granite rocks with narrow valleys between. There is an oval-shaped heap of calcareous scoria, partially covered with white carbonate of lime, grass and other vegetation which the local Brāhmaṇas aver as being the ashes of the giant Vālī, killed by Rāma as an ally of Sugrīva.

Kauśāmbī.[4] The question of the identification of Kauśāmbī has now finally been set at rest on various grounds by Rai Bahadur Daya Ram Sahni by identifying it with Kosam, a village on the left bank of Jumna, thirty miles south-west of Allahabad. It was the capital of Vatsadeśa or Vaṁśadeśa, one of the sixteen *mahājanapadas* mentioned in Jain and Buddhist works. The city is said to have been founded variously by Kuśāmba, the tenth descendant of Purūravas, by Cedī, and by Kuśāmba, the son of Kuśa, in different works. The city is known since

---

1 Cunningham, *Anc. Geog*, p. 704; Dey, *Geog. Dict*, p. 88. 2 Ray Chaudhury *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 2nd Edn. p. 86. 3 Dey, *Geog. Dict*, pp. 100-101. 4 Cunningham, *Anc. Geog*, pp. 448-452, 709; Dey, *Geog Dict*, pp. 98, 96-97; Law, *Geog Early Buddhism*, p. 16; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 2nd Edn. p. 88; Sarup, *Vision*, Notes, p. 141.

the days of *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* and is mentioned in Vedic and Buddhist works. Kauśāmbī was enumerated in the list of ten big cities of India. The well known grammarian Vararucī or Kātyāyana, the author of the *Vārtikas*, is said to have been born at Kauśāmbī and became minister of Nanda, king of Pāṭaliputra. When the city of Hastināpura was washed away by the Ganges, king Nicakṣu, the great great grandson of Janamejaya transferred his capital to Kauśāmbī.[1] The story of Udayana who ruled over Vatsadeśa with its capital at Kauśāmbī is well known especially to all students of Bhāsa. The *Lalitavistara* states that Udayana Vatsa, son of Śatānīka, king of Kauśāmbī, was born on the same day as Buddha.[2] Udayana, son of Parantapa, is said to have been converted to Buddhism by Piṇḍola; but he appears to be quite different from Udayana Vatsarāja, son of Śatānīka.[3] Udayana was the first to prepare an image of Buddha in red sandalwood during the latter's life-time. Gautama Buddha spent two years at Ghoṣita-Ārāma of Kauśāmbī.

Pāṭaliputra.[4] Pātaliputra was known by various names, all synonyms of Pāṭali—such as Kusumapura, Puṣpapura, Kusumadhvaja. Originally a small village named Pāṭaligrāma, king Ajātaśatru of Magadha laid the foundation of a large and fortified city at the site in 554 B. C. in order to repel the attacks of the Vajjis of Vaiśāli. Udayāśva, grandson of Ajātaśatru and son of Darśaka (whose existence has been confirmed by Bhāsa) removed the capital of Magadha from Rājagṛha to Pāṭaliputra. It remained the headquarters of the province for many centuries. The *Vāyupurāṇa* makes Udayāśva the founder of Kusumapura or Pāṭaliputra,

---

1 Cf. Pargiter, *Dynasties of Kali Age*, p. 5; *Mbh.* IX. 23. 40:

गङ्गायापहृते तस्मिन्नगरे नागसाह्वये।
उत्सृज्य निचक्षुर्नगरं कौशाम्ब्यां स निवत्स्यति॥

2 Cf. Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.* p. 450. 3 Rhys Davids, *Bud. Ind.* p. 7. The Buddhist accounts of such conversions as also of historical personalities and facts, especially from Hinduism are too much coloured, biassed and one-sided, and appear to have been twisted for the purpose of propaganda and hence cannot be accepted at their face value. They possess historicity or truth only if they are confirmed by independent non-Buddhist writers. From the other facts given about Udayana by the Buddhists, it appears that they meant Udayana Vatsarāja, but they have perverted history in their zeal to show the superiority of Buddhism. 4 Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect.*, pp. 78, 79, 80, 82; Chakladar, *MR*, March 1918, pp. 254-261; Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.* pp. 518, 520, 719; Dey, *Geog. Dict.* pp. 151-154.

but the Buddhist accounts, stating that Buddha in his last journey saw the fortification of the village and predicted that it would become a great city, make it quite clear that the actual building of the city was begun by Ajātaśatru, but the work was not finished till the reign of his grandson Udaya (c. 450 B. C.). The city was at its zenith in the Mauryan age being the capital of the whole Mauryan Empire, and Megasthenes, the ambassador of Seleucus Nicator in the Mauryan court, gives a glowing description of the city (Palibothra). He states that the town was situated on the confluence of the Ganges and Erannaboa (Hiraṇyabāhu or the Sona) and was 80 stadia (10 miles) in length and 15 stadia (nearly two miles) in breadth. It was surrounded by a ditch 30 cubits deep and six hundred cubits broad for receiving the sewage of the town. The fortified city walls were adorned with five hundred and seventy towers and sixty four gates.

The cities of Patna and Bankipur now occupy the site of the old Pāṭaliputra. A very small portion of modern Patna is situated on the old site. Greater portion of the old city was diluviated by the Ganges and Sona in 750 A. D. Lt. Col. Waddell has shown that nearly the whole of the site of the old city is intact. Ancient remains lie buried below Patna, Bankipur and E. I. Railway at the depth of 10 to 20 feet. The old city was situated on the northern bank of old Sona but several miles distant from the Ganges which later shifted to the south. The river Sona formerly joined the Ganges just above Patna.[1]

The Chinese knew the city as Kusumopulo. The great astronomer Āryabhaṭṭa was a resident of this place.

Mathurā.[2] Mathurā on the Jumna was the capital of Śūrasena, one of the sixteen *mahājanapadas*. Modern Mathurā is not on the ancient spot, which has moved northward owing to encroachment of the Jumna. Mathurā or Madhurā is generally identified with Maholi five miles south-west of the present town of Muttra. Mathurā is associated with Lord Kṛṣṇa and many sites are shown at present that played important parts in the adventures

1 Cunningham, *Anc. Geog*, pp. 520, 719. 2 Cunningham, *Anc. Geog*, pp. 429, 706; Dey, *Geog. Dict*, pp. 127, 128, 197.

of child Kṛṣṇa. At a place called Janmabhūmi or Kārāgāra near Potarakunda, Kṛṣṇa was born. Yogamāyā was dashed to the ground by Kaṁsa at Jog-ghat. The hunch-back Kubjā was cured at Kubjā's well and the fight with Cāṇūra and Muṣṭika was staged at Mallapura adjoining the temple of Keśavadeva. Kaṁsa was killed at Kaṁsa-ka-Tila outside the southern gate of the present city.

Mathurā is also associated with the penance of Dhruva.

Madura the famous South Indian temple-city is known as Dakṣiṇa Mathurā. The reference in our plays is only to Mathurā of Lord Kṛṣṇa.

Rājagṛha.[1] Rājagṛha, also known as Girivraja, was the ancient capital of Magadha. The *Rāmāyaṇa* tells that Girivraja was known by the name of Vasumatī and the *Mahābhārata* that it was also called Bārhadrathapura and Magadhapura. Rājagṛha was surrounded by five hills and the river Sarasvatī flowed through the city passing out by the side of the northern gate, and the river Bāṇagaṅgā lay to the south of the city. At the time of the *Rāmāyaṇa* the river Sona flowed through Rājagṛha. Bimbisāra commenced fortifying and laying out the new town of Rājagṛha one mile to the north of the old site, and the operations were completed by his son Ajātaśatru who transferred his capital to new Rājagṛha. The new capital enjoyed supremacy for a short period till the headquarters were removed to Pāṭaliputra in the reign of Udāyi or Udayāśva. Rājagṛha had a gate which used to be closed in the evening after which no body, not even the king, could be admitted into the city.

Rājagṛha corresponds to Rajagir in Bihar, sixty two miles from Patna among the hills near Gaya.

Veṇuvanavihāra was the monastery in the bamboo grove near Rājagṛha which was presented by king Bimbisāra to Buddha, who resided there when he visited Rājagṛha. It was situated just outside the north gate of the city at the foot of the Baibhara hill.[2] At a hill named Suvarṇagiri near

---

1 Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.* pp. 535, 721; Dey, *Geog. Dict*, pp. 66-69, 165; Law, *Geog. Early Bud*, pp. 9, 11; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 3rd Edn. p. 78. 2 Dey, *Geog. Dict*, p. 29. Veṇuvana mentioned by Bhāsa in the *Pratijñā* (p. 8, 1st Edn.) is certainly different from this Veṇuvanavihāra. It was situated either near Narmadā or near Yamunā.

old Rājagrha, Aśoka passed his days after abdication.

There are two other Rājagrhas one on the northern bank of the Bias in the Punjab which was the capital of Aśvapati of Kekaya; the other was the capital of Balkh; but our poet evidently refers to Rājagrha, the capital of Magadha.

Laṅkā.[1] Laṅkā was the capital of the state of that name. Many fantastic descriptions of the city, about its vast amount of gold and jewellery are to be found in some works. The city is at present said to have been at the site of a mountain on the south-east corner of Ceylon. Some believe it to be the present Mantotte in Ceylon, while others think that the town has submerged.

Virāṭanagara.[2] Virāṭanagara was the capital of Matsya, the country of Virāṭa. It corresponds with Vairat (or Bairat) a village in Jaipur state, one hundred and five miles to the south-west of Delhi and forty one miles to the north of Jaipur. Some of the most famous edicts of Aśoka have been found at Bairat.[3] The excavations in Jaipur State conducted under the able guidance of Rai Bahadur Daya Ram Sahni have resulted in many valuable articles of archæological interest being unearthed at Bairat and other places.[4] According to Nandolal Dey it is a mistake to identify Virāta with Dinajpur.

Vairantya.[5] Vairantya was the capital of Kuntibhoja according to Bhāsa. It is also mentioned in the *Harṣacarita* as the capital of Rantideva. As the capital of Rantideva, it has been identified with Rintambur or Rintipur on the Gomti a branch of the Cambal.

Bhāsa has described the city in his *Avimāraka.* We have dealt with the description in a later chapter on "Urban and Rural Life".

Śṛṅgiverapura.[6] Śṛṅgiverapura where Rāma crossed the Ganges on his way to Daṇḍaka has been identified with Singraur on the Ganges twenty-two miles north-west of Allahabad. It was the residence of Guhaka Niṣāda. It is also known by the name of Ramachaura.

1 Dey, *Geog. Dict.* pp. 113–114. 2 Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.* pp. 387, 391; Dey, *Geog. Dict.* p. 38; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. India*, 3rd Edn, p. 45. 3 Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 1st Edn, p. 71. 4 Cf. *Archæological Remains and Excavations at Bairat*, by Rai Bahadur Daya Ram Sahni. 5 Dey, *Geog. Dict.* pp. 16–17, 167. 6 Dey, *Geog. Dict.* p. 192.

Hastināpura.[1] Hastināpura was the capital of Kuru to the north-east of Delhi. The old site is entirely diluviated by the Ganges. It is identified with an old town in Mawana Tahsil twenty-two miles north-east of Mirat and south-west of Bijnor on the right bank of the Ganges. Hastināpura (or Gajasāhvaya) was probably known as Āsandīvat in the Vedic age. Gaḍamukteśvara containing the temple of Mukteśwara Mahādeva was a quarter of ancient Hastināpura. Nicakṣu the great great grandson of Janamejaya removed his capital to Kauśāmbī after Hastināpura was washed away by the Ganges.

MOUNTAINS.

Krauñca Parvata.[2] Krauñca Parvata was that part of the Kailāsa mountain of the Himālayas on which the Mānasa Sarovara is situated.

Trikūṭa.[3] Mr. Dey mentions four Trikūṭas, viz. (1) in the south-east corner of Ceylon ; (2) Trikota to the north of the Punjab and south of Kashmir ; (3) Junnar ; and (4) the Yamnotri in the Himālayas. The reference being from the *Rāmāyaṇa* in our plays, the first from the above was evidently meant by Bhāsa.

Mandara.[4] The *Varāha Purāṇa* states that Mandara is situated to the south of the Ganges and on the Vindhya range. Mr. Dey identifies Mandara or Mandaragiri with a hill seven hundred feet high situated in the Banka division of Bhagalpore district two or three miles to the north of Bamsi and thirty miles to the south of Bhagalpore. Mandara, according to the *Purāṇas*, was used by the gods and demons to churn the ocean and the serpent Vāsuki was utilized as a rope. There is a groove all around the hill in the middle, which the orthodox people take as suggesting the tying up of Vāsuki. The groove, however, is evidently artificial according to Mr. Dey, and bears the mark of the chisel. There are two Buddhist temples on the top of the hill which are now worshipped by the Jainas. On the western side of the hill is a natural cavity in the rocks containing

1 Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.* p. 702; Dey, *Geog. Dict.* p. 74 ; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.* 2nd Edn. pp. 11, 22. 2 Dey, *Geog. Dict.* p. 104. 3 Dey, *Geog. Dict.* pp. 205-206. 4 Dey, *Geog. Dict.* pp. 109, 144-145.

a large quantity of pure limpid spring water called Ākāśagaṅgā and a colossal image of Vāmanadeva and a huge sculpture of Madhukaiṭabha. At the foot of the hill are extensive ruins of old temples and other buildings and also a tank called Pāpahāriṇī where people bathe on the last day of Pauṣa when the image of Madhusūdana is brought there from the town of Bamsi.

The *Mahābhārata*, however, recognizes no other Mandara except on the Himālayas and that is shown to be a portion of the Himālayas to the east of Sumeru in Garhwal. Some *Purāṇas* place the Badarikāśrama containing the temple of Nara and Nārāyaṇa on the Mandara, but the *Mahābhārata* locates the Mandara to the east of the Gandhamādana and the north of Badarikāśrama. According to the *Vāmanapurāṇa*, Mahādeva resided here after his marriage with Pārvatī.

Malayagiri.[1] The southern parts of the Western Ghats south of the Kāverī known as the Travancore hills constitute the Malaya mountain. It also includes the Cardamum mountains, the whole extending from the Coimbatore gap to Cape Comorin. Malayakoti has been identified with the promontory where the Western Ghats dip into the sea.

One of the summits of the mountain known as the Agastyakūṭa mountain in Tinnevelly is said to be the residence of Agastya. It is also called Potiyam, the southern-most peak of the Annamalai mountains from where the river Tāmraparṇī has its source.[2] This Agastyakūṭa seems to be the place referred to by Meghanāda in the *Avimāraka*.[3]

Mahendra.[4] The whole range of hills extending from Orissa to Madura district was known as Mahendra Parvata. Principally, however, the name was applied to the range of hills separating Ganjam from the valley of the Mahānadī. A part of the range extending from North Sircars to Goṇḍavana lying near Ganjam is still known as Mahendramalei or the hills of Mahendra.

Meru.[5] According to Mr. Sherring all local traditions

1 Dey, *Geog. Dict*, p. 122. 2 Dey, *Geog. Dict*, pp. 2, 122. 3 *Avi*, p. 68 —अथ भगवन्तमगस्त्यमाराधयितुं मलयपर्वते विद्याधरैस्सह प्रारब्धः। 4 Dey, *Geog. Dict*, p. 119. 5 Dey, *Geog. Dict*, pp. 196-197.

fix mount Meru as lying direct to the north of the Almora district. Mount Kedāranātha in Garhwal is still traditionally known as the original Meru. Mr. Dey identifies it with the Rudra Himālaya in Garhwal where the Ganges has its source; it lies near Badarikāśrama and is also called Pañcaparvata on account of its five peaks. According to the *Matsya Purāṇa*, Sumeru is bounded on the north by Uttarakuru, on the south by Bhāratavarṣa, on the west by Ketumālā and on the east by Bhadrāśvavarṣa.

Vindhya.[1] Vindhya or Vindhyācala is the same as the Vindhya hills to the north of river Narmadā which runs eastward from the Baroda State. The range of the Vindhya hills then turns northwards and approaches the banks of the Ganges. The celebrated temple of Vindyavāsinī is situated on these hills near Gazipur. At a short distance from this is the temple of the eight-armed Yogamāyā who came back to the hills after warning Kaṁsa. The fight between Durgā and Śumbha and Niśumbha took place on the Vindhyācala. Another Vindhya has been identified by Pargiter with the hills and plateau of South Mysore.

Suvela.[2] Suvela was the mountain at the foot of which Rāma had encamped with his army on his arrival in Laṅkā. It seems to have been near the sea as also near the capital of Laṅkā.

Himālaya. Himālaya is the same as the famous Himālayan range.

RIVERS.

The Ganges, Narmadā and Jumna are the only rivers mentioned by the poet, and these were the same as the rivers known by the same names at present.

Besides the above, the poet has referred to a number of places which were only of temporary importance and hence cannot be identified at present. Udyāmaka and Yūpagrāma were two villages in the Kurujāṅgala.[3] Veṇuvana, Nāgavana, Vālukātīrtha and Madayantikā (v. l. Madagandhira) were the stages in the journey from the Vatsa kingdom to Malwa.[4] Lāvāṇaka was on the

---

1 Dey, *Geog. Dict.*, p. 37; also Pargiter, *JRAS*, 1894, p. 261. 2 Cf. *Abh.* p. 54. 3 *Mv.* pp. 25, 26. 4 *Pratijñā*, 2nd Edn. p. 16.

frontiers of the Vatsa kingdom, and it was well known for specialization in Vedic learning.[1]

It appears from the places mentioned above that in the period when the poet flourished countries to the north of the Narmadā were well known and there was practically no knowledge of the trans-Vindhyan southern region of India. The southern places and mountains such as Mahendra, Laṅkā, Suvela, Malaya and Kiṣkindhā are simply copied from the *Rāmāyaṇa*. This, of course, does not in any way help us to fix the chronology of the poet, as it has been shown that the whole of India was thoroughly known to the Indians from very ancient times. It is always unsafe to dogmatize on the strength of stray instances or arguments ex silentia. Probably, after the era of adventurous merchants and colonizers was over, the general populace fell in the dark as to the topography of the country and the ignorance continued till the Maurya emperors and their successors led their armies southwards and annexed or subjugated the southern countries.

The separate mention of small states as separate entities, however, definitely places the poet in the pre-Mauryan period or in a period closely allied to the Mauryan epoch when the memory of the separate states was still fresh; for it would have been almost impossible for a poet coming long after the period of their unification and inclusion in the Mauryan empire and the loss of their individuality, to mention the states, especially when we take into consideration the scanty historical material the ancients furnish us with, with all our 'historical research'. So it can better be imagined how utterly impossible it would have been for a poet of a late date to refer to such details; to speak nothing of a southerner! Post-Aśokan dramatists portraying southern countries exhibit a wide and accurate knowledge of their topography.

---

1 *Sources*, p. 27; Bhandarkar, *Carm. Lect*, p. 92.

CHAPTER XI.

VARṆĀŚRAMADHARMA.

(A) Castes, their Relations and Occupations.

The institution known variously as *varṇa*, *jāti* or caste is peculiar to India and was of indigenous origin. There is a difference of opinion among scholars as to whether distinctions based on *varṇa* preceded those based on *jāti* or vice versa. Mr. C. V. Vaidya holds that before the Aryans settled in the Punjab there were two *jātis*, *viz.*, the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas, among them; those that took to agriculture formed into Vaiśyas; then after the Aryans settled in India and extended eastwards, the aborigines who were black-coloured came into the social system of the Aryans, and they were placed at the foot of the system as Śūdras. Thus *varṇa* or colour came in after *jāti*, and was incorporated into the caste system, being later taken as the characteristic of a *jāti*.[1] Some, on the contrary, hold that the Aryans had no distinctions when they came to India, and the Āryas and Dasyus or the Dāsas (non-Aryans) were the first distinctions based on colour. The Aryans then formed themselves into three different classes according to the natures of their works and included Dasyus or Dāsas among their structure as the fourth class. Thus came into being the *Cāturvarṇya* or the four-fold caste system in India. According to Megasthenes, "No one is allowed to marry out of his own caste or to exchange one profession or trade for another".[2] In other words, endogamy and rigidity as to particular duties or occupations were the two principal characteristics of the caste system in India.

1 *Upasaṁhāra*, pp. 171-172. 2 Fragment XXXIII, *McCrindle's translation*.

We shall now see whether the caste system as such was known in the age of the *Ṛgveda*. Many eminent orientalists such as Aufrecht, Benfey, Max Müller, Muir, Roth, Weber and Zimmer formulate that it was unknown, while Haug, Kern, Ludwig, Oldenberg and Geldner maintain that the caste system existed in the Ṛgvedic age.[1] It is, however, found that excepting in the *Puruṣasūkta* there is absolutely no mention of the caste system in the *Ṛgveda*. The distinctions in the *Puruṣasūkta*, moreover, are class distinctions in contrast to the caste distinctions of the later age. These four classes were, as it were, of the clergy, the noble, the middle class and the labourers; they did not connote any caste distinctions.[2] Rules as to marriage and occupations were not rigid. Any one could change his occupation and intermarriages in different classes were allowed.[3] The divisions into classes in the Ṛgvedic age depended more upon occupation, ability and character than upon birth. Knowledge was the basis of the system.

In course of time, by the period of the *Brāhmaṇas*, the distinctions between the different classes gradually accentuated. The Śūdras were looked down with disfavour and marriages with them were prohibited; then impurity was said to be attached to the food offered by the Śūdras and then came the impurity of touch. Then by the same principles of exclusion, the Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas were kept at a distance by the Brāhmaṇas and they finally asserted their superiority and enunciated the bold doctrine that birth alone can confer Brahminhood on a person; no person of any other class can attain to it.[4]

The epics also show the advanced stage of the caste system, the society being divided into watertight compartments. Though intermarriages were disfavoured, a number of them took place, and the issues were looked as of mixed castes. There were a number of mixed castes in the epic age, the progeny taking the intermediate position inferior to the status of its father and superior to that of its mother. Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* also shows that the four-fold caste system was deep-rooted at the time. The

1 Cf. Majumdar, *Corporate Life*, p. 330; Max Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop*, II, p. 307; Weber, *Ind. Lit.* (Trans.), p. 38; Roth quoted in *Muir's Sanskrit Texts*, I, p. 291. 2 Cf. Majumdar, *Corporate Life*, pp. 331-333. 3 *Ṛgveda*, IX. 112. 3. 4 Majumdar, *Corporate Life*, pp. 347-350.

evolution of the caste system from the classes in the *Ṛgveda* is important to students of social history inasmuch as "it affected the status of citizens and affected their duties as members of the body politic".[1] A man's position in later days was determined by the caste in which he was born and not by his intrinsic merits or character.

Though the Buddhists waged a severe war against the caste system and the Brāhmaṇa superiority, it is a mistake to suppose that the caste system was non-existent in the Buddhist age. As a matter of fact even the Buddhist writings recognized the formal castes.[2] In contrast to the Brahmanical works which state that the Brāhmaṇa superiority was throughout unchallenged, the Buddhist writers show a distinct Kṣatriya bias and put the Kṣatriya claim to undisputed superiority, the Jain writers supporting them. In spite of the crushing attitude towards the Brāhmaṇas, we find many instances of the Brāhmaṇas being regarded with respect in the Buddhist age. The caste system did exist in the Buddhist age though some restrictions as to food and occupation were relaxed. After the revival of the Brāhmaṇas under the Guptas, the Brāhmaṇas emerged as the supreme race and the rules of the caste system were made rigid and inelastic. Among the writings on the caste system both from the pen of Indian and foreign writers almost all of whom indulge in attacking and condemning the system, one is rather relieved to read of the different note struck by Prof. Viswanatha when he says that "the caste laws were laws of spiritual eugenics intended to foster and promote the evolution of a superior race".[3]

With regard to the occupations of these different castes, they were more or less fixed. It was the duty of the Brāhmaṇas to study and teach the Vedas, to perform sacrifices and officiate at sacrifices, to give charity and receive gifts. The Kṣatriya took to himself the protection of the people, charity, performance of sacrifices, study and non-attachment to pleasure. The Vaiśyas engaged themselves in cattle-rearing, agriculture, charity, performance of sacrifices, study, trade and money-lending. The only duty of the Śūdras was to serve the persons of the three higher castes.[4] At first these rules were very rigid. No

1 Banerji, *Pub. Adm.* p. 20. 2 *CHI*, I, p. 221; *Corporate Life*, p. 364.
3 *Racial Synthesis*, p. 149. 4 *Manusmṛti*, I. 88-91; cf. also *Śāntiparva*, 72.

one was allowed to occupy in any but the hereditary profession; but gradually, the upper castes, if in distress, were allowed to engage in the professions of the lower ones. Under no circumstances were the lower orders to do the functions of the higher ones. It was taken to be the prime duty of the king to see that the four castes engaged themselves in their respective occupations as prescribed for them.[1]

With these preliminary observations on the caste system, we turn to our plays to gather whatever information they supply regarding this ancient institution. It does not require much proof to find that the caste system was prevalent in those days. The four castes are distinctly mentioned,[2] the Brāhmaṇas being the caste par excellence. Castes seem to have been based only on birth at the time of our poet, and not on occupations or qualities as in the early Vedic age as we have seen. Descent in the family of a Brāhmaṇa was necessary to acquire Brahminhood. Those that were born of the Brāhmaṇas were known as such, while those of the Kṣatriya parentage were known as the Kṣatriyas.[3] There is no mention of mixed castes born of the intercaste wedlock and out of wedlock so elaborately enumerated by the *Smṛti* writers. We think we shall not be far from right if we conclude from this that the mixed castes were almost unknown, that strict conformity to marriage rules prevailed in those days, and that there was a high tone of morality. The Cāṇḍālas are mentioned: but evidently they were outside the caste system.

BRĀHMAṆAS.

The Brāhmaṇas deserve to be treated first on account of the importance attached to them and also on account of the numerous references attached to them in the plays. The sacred thread was then, as it is in most cases even now, a badge and a distinguishing mark of the Brāhmaṇas.[4] Without entering into the detailed

---

1 Cf. *Arthaśāstra*. I. 3 sū. 1 & 2 p. 8.—तस्मात्स्वधर्मं भूतानां राजा न व्यभिचारयेत्। etc. 2 Vaṇik as distinct from Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya is mentioned in *Cār* (p. 45) and Vṛṣala (Śūdra) is referred to in the *Pratimā* (III. 5.) and *Paṅc* (I. 6). 3 Cf. *Paṅc*, I. 25.—द्विजो भवान् क्षत्रियवंशजो वयम्। *Karṇa*, p. 75.—अस्ति खलु तत्रभवतः क्षत्रियवंशैः पूर्ववैरम्। *Avi*. I. 7 दैवे रूपे भद्रमं तस्य वाक्यम्। also *Avi*, p. 14: *Prat*. III. 5 (p. 60); p. 61. 4 *Avi*, p. 85.—जण्णोपवीदिणं बम्हणो।

discussion of the problem we state here our inference that *Yajñopavita* in those days was not merely a thread but a piece of cloth.[1] The Brāhmaṇas were regarded as the prime race, front rank being given to them among the subjects.[2] The superiority of the Brāhmaṇas and the precedence accorded to them on all occasions were so much ingrained in the minds of all, that the veteran Bhīṣma states the fact of his being a Kṣatriya (and hence a disciple) as one of the reasons, why Duryodhana should first make his obeisance to Droṇa, a Brāhmaṇa, in preference to himself (*i. e.* Bhīṣma) though he was, in the words of Droṇa, a deity in human form.[3] The utterance of a Brāhmaṇa received immense weight, even untrue statements emanating from him were regarded as true, and he was never to be contradicted.[4] The speech or request of a Brāhmaṇa commanded implicit obedience.[5] Such a tyrant as Kaṁsa glorified himself in taking the word of a Brāhmaṇa as gospel truth. The Brāhmaṇas also were equally confident of having never uttered falsehood.[6]

Closely allied with the desire to carry out the word of a Brāhmaṇa was the general thought that the curse of a Brāhmaṇa was sure to bring calamity. The king of the Sauvīras voluntarily underwent exile and Cāṇḍālahood with his family, to bring about the fulfilment of the curse that a Brāhmaṇa pronounced.[7] Kaikeyī in the *Pratimā* shared all the disgrace and misery simply to cause the curse to her husband to fructify.[8]

The Brāhmaṇas were naturally held as the preceptors of the Kṣatriyas and it was thought a disgrace to the disciple where the guru was poor. All the wealth as also the religious merit of sacrifice were regarded as fruitless if the guru was not satisfied.[9] It was the most desirable thing for a king to give everything to the

---

1 *Cār*, p. 63.—अणोपवीदमत्तपावरणो । ; also G. Jha, *AMV*, I, pp. 62-64; V. Bhattacharya, *Visvabharati Qtly.*, July 1933, pp. 107-117. 2 *Bāl*, III. 16—नोब्राह्मणादयस्तेन क्षुब्ध्यन्ते किल प्रजाः । *Bāl*, p. 54—ब्राह्मणपुरोगाश्च सर्वप्रजाः । ; *Ms*, st. 9. द्विजोत्तमाः पूज्यतमाः पृथिव्याम् । *Ms*, p. 30—पूज्यतमः खलु ब्राह्मणः । ; *Pañc*. I. 25—द्विजो भवान् क्षत्रियबालको वयम् । 3 *Pañc*, I. 26, 27. 4 *Pañc*, p. 89—ब्राह्मणेष्वनृतरा वयम् । *Bāl*, p. 27—ब्राह्मणवचनमनृतमपि सत्यं वक्ष्यामि । 5 *Karṇa*, p. 84—ब्राह्मणवचनमिति । न मयातिक्रान्तपूर्वम् । 6 *Bāl*, p. 27—अनृत नाभिहितपूर्व मया । 7 *Avi*, I. 11; also p. 96. 8 *Prat*, pp. 118-119.—अपरिहरणीयो मदरिसिसावो । 9 *Pañc*, I. 28.—किं तद् द्रव्यं किं फलं को विशेषः क्षुधार्तायां यत्र विप्रो दरिद्रः ।

Brāhmaṇas and leave only his bow as an heirloom to his sons.[1] To save the life of a Brāhmaṇa by giving up one's body was very highly thought of.[2]

Feeding the Brāhmaṇas in order to propitiate untoward fate and to ward off evils was very common. It was supposed to bring peace.[3] This attitude finds, curiously enough, a parallel in the *Jātaka* stories where the giving of gifts to the Brāhmaṇas and Śramaṇas and the duty of feeding them were enjoined on the king and the commoner alike; and even the Bodhisatva himself is reported to have said: "I have given manifold gifts to monks and Brāhmaṇas."[4]

The superiority of the Brāhmaṇas would naturally show the prevalence of Brahmanical rites and ceremonies and praises of *dakṣiṇā*. The festivals of Ratnaṣaṣṭhī, Kālāṣṭamī and Caturdaśī are mentioned, in which, among other things the payment of fees *(dakṣiṇās)* and giving of sumptuous dinner to the Brāhmaṇas were the main factors.[5] We find many similes pertaining to the sacrifices, the sacrificial fire, sacrificer, the *yajñaśakaṭa*, etc., giving us some idea as to the institution; the Brāhmaṇas are eulogized in the descriptions. The depreciatory attitude in the *Jātakas* towards animal sacrifices and their preachings against the sacrifices do not seem to have gained ground.[6]

The reference to the rule that the Brāhmaṇas were exempt from capital punishment in spite of any offence committed by them raises an interesting point.[7] Not only are the Brāhmaṇas said to be immune from being killed, but they are to be let off, apparently without any punishment. Dr. Ray Chaudhury has tried to show by giving instances from the *Brāhmaṇas*, the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* and the *Mahābhārata* that no such immunity

---

1 *Pañc.* I. 22.—विभोत्तंहे वित्तमाकर्ष सर्वं राज्ञा देयं चापमात्रं सुतेभ्यः। 2 *Mv.* p. 30.—मच्छरीरेण ब्राह्मणशरीरं विनिर्मोतुमिच्छामि। 3 *Pratijñā*, p. 21.—महिणा सन्तिणिमित्तं उवट्ठिअभोअणं बम्हणाअं। *Cār*, p. 6.—इच्छेअं...बम्हणं णिमन्तेदुं। *Cār*, p. 84—सव्वसारविभवेण बम्हणेण सोत्थि वाअइदव्वंति। *Bāl*, I. 25. —करोमि विपुलां शान्तिं मम शान्तिर्भविष्यति। 4 *Jā*. IV. 450, 484, 489, 497; V. 528, 536, 540; VI. 545. 5 *Cār*, p. 84; *Pratijñā*, pp. 50,48; *Cār*, p. 7. घिदं गुलं दधिं तण्डुला च सव्वं अत्थि। अपि च दक्खिणामास आणि भविस्सन्ति। 6 *Jā*, I. 50, 77; II. 162; III. 314; IV. 495. The period refers to the beginning of the invasion of Buddhism on Hinduism. 7 *Mv*, st. 34, p. 27. —सर्वापराधेऽवध्यत्वान्मुच्यतां द्विजसत्तमः।

from capital punishment existed in ancient times.[1] The *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya, though written by a Brāhmaṇa, is said to be distinguished throughout by want of undue partiality for the Brāhmaṇas. Dr. Ray begins his thesis by stating that the Brāhmaṇas enjoyed no prominence nor any special privileges. Towards the close of his article, however, he is rightly required to admit that the position of the Brāhmaṇas as a class "was a somewhat privileged one".[2] It was a sign of the times that the *Arthaśāstra*, though professedly a book on politics and proclaiming impartial treatment to all alike, could not but promulgate special rules in the case of the Brāhmaṇas on account of their status. Even many of the *Jātakas* testify to the high position and great esteem enjoyed by the Brāhmaṇas. In the days of our poet, the Brāhmaṇas were proficient in all the *Vedas* and *Vedāṅgas*, the *Dharmaśāstra*, *Arthaśāstra*, *Yogaśāstra*, *Nyāyaśāstra*, *Śrāddhakalpa*, etc.[3] Though all these *śāstras* appear to us as too voluminous for studies in these days, they were included in the normal course of a learned Brāhmaṇa. They conveyed no speciality or anything extraordinary in those days. In spite of an all round spread of education in traditional lore among the Brāhmaṇas, the custodians of Vedic learning, a thoroughly ignorant Brāhmaṇa was not a rarity. The jester in the *Avimāraka* remarks on the contrary that it was difficult to come across a Brāhmaṇa knowing both—the word (*i. e.*, the Vedas) and its meaning.[4] Evidently the jester's word is not to be taken at its face value and the reasonable inference seems to be that, as ever, there were black sheep in every fold in those days also. Moreover, the jester's observation shows that as now there were at the time of our poet, many so-called priests who simply memorized the *mantras* without caring to know their meaning.

KṢATRIYAS.

Though not idealized as in the *Jātakas*, we find that the Kṣatriyas also occupied a very high position, next only

---

1 *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 1st Ed., p. 192. The evidence, however, does not warrant the conclusion. 2 *OC*, II, pp. 389-396 at p. 395. 3 *Prat*, p. 99 "...ब्राह्मणसमुदाचारमनुष्ठास्यामि।...साङ्गोपाङ्गं वेदमधीषे, मानवीयं धर्मशास्त्रं, माहेश्वरं योगशास्त्रं, बार्हस्पत्यमर्थशास्त्रं, मेधातिथेर्न्यायशास्त्रं, प्राचेतसं श्राद्धकल्पं च। 4 *Avi*, p. 16.—बम्भणो दुल्लहो अक्खरदम्भो अत्थञ्ञो भ।

to that of the Brāhmaṇas. They held the Brāhmaṇas in high esteem, and the protection of their subjects was the main duty assigned to them.[1] The king, who generally came from the Kṣatriyas, was to see that the subjects followed the rules according to their castes and orders, and he was not to introduce any violent changes in the rules, and was simply to uphold the old laws and customs.[2]

The Kṣatriyas being the saviours of humanity looked upon all persons as their own sons.[3] The riches of the Kṣatriyas were held to consist in their valour in war and archery and not in the amount of wealth amassed by them; their wealth, further, depended on their bravery.[4] The Kṣatriyas were told to perform sacrifices and feed the Brāhmaṇas and the poor at them, as the merits obtained thereby endure long after the physical bodies have perished. A number of famous kings are mentioned such as Ikṣvāku, Śayyāti and others who live in the memory of the people only through their sacrifices.[5] It seems to have been a rule that the Kṣatriyas were not to be addressed by their mere names by ordinary persons but some title was to be prefixed to their names.[6] There does not appear to be any trace of the rivalry for superiority between the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas which the accounts in the *Jātakas* and other Buddhist works indicate.[7] The duties and functions of the Kṣatriyas as 'Kings' will be dealt with in detail in a later chapter entitled 'Court Life'.

VAIŚYAS.

The Vaiśyas are incidentally mentioned in the *Cārudatta*, and there they are spoken of as travelling in foreign countries for trade and taking a circuitous way for fear of thieves.[8] A glimpse into the life of the herdsmen who tended cattle is to be had from the *Bālacarita* and the *Pañcarātra*.[9] Cows to them were as mothers and goddesses, and their first duty on getting up was to bow to these cow-mothers. "Blessings and peace to the cows"

---

1 *Karṇa* st. 47.—तस्मात्त्र्राणपालनमात्त्रवृद्धया । 2 *Arthaśāstra*, Adhyāya 3, p. 8, st. 1 and 2. 3 *Mṛ*, p. 31.—सर्वाः प्रजाः क्षत्त्रियाणां पुत्त्रशब्देनाभिधीयन्ते । 4 *Pañc*, I. 24.—त्राणाधीना क्षत्त्रियाणां समृद्धिः । 5. *Pañc*, I. 20—यज्ञेन भोजय महीं जय विक्रमेण । I. 25.—नष्टाः शरीरैः क्रतुभिर्भवन्ते । 6 *Pañc*, II. 47. 7 Fick, *Social Organisation*, p. 183. 8 *Cār*, p. 45—वणिजदारओ कीवि आअन्तुओ ।; p. 77—णीदीए उप्पहेणपुत्तो विअ वणिओ ।; p. 78—विक्खिण्णिदभण्डिओ विअ वणिओ । 9 *Bāl*, Act III; *Pañc*, Act II.

is the constant refrain in their prayers to the gods.[1] Among persons following different trades we find references to florists, painters, washermen, shampooers, etc.

ŚŪDRAS.

The Śūdras are referred to in the *Pratimā* and the *Pañcarātra*.[2] The passages in those plays suggest that untouchability was observed in those days at least in so far as religious functions were concerned. It was illegal for a Śūdra to study the Vedas and consequently to utter the *mantras;* hence the Śūdras worshipped the deities and made their obeisance to them without chanting any *mantras*. It is significant that even courtesans thought it unfit and improper to lavish their favours on a Śūdra youth. It did not occur to the maid of a courtesan that a Śūdra youth could ever become the object of love of her mistress. Intermarriages were not prohibited in ancient India; and hence, in course of time, mixed castes arose as the result of *anuloma* and *pratiloma* marriages. We do not, however, find any reference to mixed castes in these plays.

CĀṆḌĀLAS.

The Cāṇḍālas were not subject to the rules of the caste system. Even the sight of a Cāṇḍāla polluted the caste people. The Cāṇḍālas had their residences outside the city beyond the cremation grounds.[4] They were looked upon as incapable of having feelings of sympathy, mercy, good speech, fine form, valour and strength.

THEIR RELATIONS.

As regards the relations of the different castes among themselves there is nothing in the plays to show that they were not cordial. Each caste showed at least a tolerant attitude towards the others. All were intent on doing their own duties (स्वे स्वे कर्मण्यभिरताः) thereby helping

---

1 Some features of the pastoral life as culled from these dramas have been presented later on under "Urban and Rural Life." 2 *Prat*, III. 5. वार्धलस्तु प्रणामः स्यादमन्त्रार्चितदैवतः ; *Pañc*, I. 6—द्विज इव वृषलं पार्श्वे न सहते । 3 *Cār*, pp. 44-45. 4 *Avi*, p. 14; *Pañc*, p. 52; *Bāl*, II. 5; also, *Arthaśāstra*, II. 35. p. 96. —पाषण्डचाण्डालानां महानाम्ने वासः । 5 *Avi*, p. 7, also I. 7 and II. 5.

themselves and others, and did not think it worth their while to disturb others outside their spheres.

Concerning the occupations, the injunctions do not seem to have been very strictly adhered to. Though most of the persons followed the scriptures in connection with the specific professions or trades to be followed by them, there was also a very small number who contravened the rules. Thus, we find a Brāhmaṇa youth engaging himself in trade, and another, under the influence of cupid, stooping to housebreaking at night.[1] The *Jātakas* also make mention of Brāhmaṇas following diverse occupations as also of the changes of occupations in turn by certain individuals.[2] Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* adds to the duties of the Śūdras by allowing them to till the soil, to rear cattle, to trade or to do business as artisans or actors.[3] Thus, it appears that in the days when these plays were written (*i. e.*, in the pre-Mauryan age) strict rules as to the occupations to be followed by different castes were slightly relaxed. The onrush of Buddhism had not yet dealt a serious blow to the caste system in the period we are dealing with. Brāhmaṇa superiority was the rule everywhere and Buddhism was not found favour with.

(B) Four orders (*Āśramas*) and their duties.

In every society are to be found systems analogous to *jāti* and *āśrama* in India. The different classes are known according to their occupations, such as, the clergy, the nobles, the labourers, etc. Birth has nothing to do with classes as in the case of castes in India. Every individual in general, again, goes through some stages in his life. During childhood he is engaged in learning; then comes married life; and in old age he may be concerned with religious thoughts or those concerning the other world. The speciality of India lay in the fact that both the systems were connected with, and made the essential parts of the religious system.

There is a difference in the origin and development of the caste system and the *āśrama* system in India. The

1 Cārudatta and Sajjalaka in the *Cār.* 2 Fick, *Social Organisation*, p. 101; Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 54-55; *Legacy of India*, p. 142. 3 *Arthaśāstra*, I. 3, p. 7; *Viṣṇusmṛti* (Ch. 2) mentions all industrial arts (सर्वशिल्पानि) as falling within the occupations of Śūdras.

caste system, as we have seen, was not strictly observed in the beginning but its rules became more and more rigid in course of time, till the society was divided into water-tight compartments. The *āśrama* rules, on the other hand, introduced as they were for promoting the efficiency of the individual and hence of the society in general, were rather strictly followed at the beginning, but in later times none cared to observe those rules.

In the Vedic times, the relations of life were regulated by the requirements of the individual and not by cast-iron rules There is no trace of the *āśrama* rules in the *Ṛgveda* though it appears that the first two stages only, *viz.* Brahmacarya and Gṛhasthāśrama were gone into. We get the first glimpse of the doctrines of the four *āśramas* (stages of life) whereby the ascetic and hermit lives were introduced into the system, only in the Upaniṣadic period.[1] The life of every Aryan (*i. e.*, a member of the first three castes) according to this doctrine was required to pass through four stages of life, *viz.* that of a Brahmacārī (pupil), Gṛhastha (householder), Vānaprastha (forest hermit), and Sannyāsin (ascetic). In the period of the *Mahābhārata*, were to be seen the first germs of the tendency whereby Sannyāsa, the last stage of life was reserved only for the Brahmaṇas. A number of reasons have been put forth for the promulgation of the rule as to the exclusion of the other castes from leading the life of an ascetic, but for the purposes of our present study we are not concerned with them.

The *Mahābhārata* and the *Dharmaśāstras* prescribe a number of rules to be followed by individuals in each stage of their life, and we shall refer to these rules in brief later on. A commentator on the *Mahābhārata* states that a Śūdra was entitled only to the first *āśrama* and each member of the higher caste was entitled to one succeeding *āśrama* in addition; thus, a Vaiśya could pass through only two *āśramas*, a Kṣatriya through three, and a Brāhmaṇa through all the four stages of life.[2] The Buddhists had also a system analogous to the *āśramadharma* and they had made elaborate rules especially in regard to the life of the Bhikkhus. As the Buddhists were against the caste

1 Winternitz, *HIL*, I, p. 233. 2 *Śāntiparva*, 59. 2-Com; Dikshitar, *Hindu Adm. Inst.*, p. 46.

sysem, the doors of each stage of life were thrown open to all irrespective of the barriers of birth or sex. The *Arthaśāstra* also speaks about the four *āśramas* and the duties pertaining to each, but it is not stated whether all the castes were entitled to embrace Sannyāsa.

Before proceeding to give the information supplied by our author with regard to the state of the *āśramadharma* in his days, it would be instructive if the duties of the different *āśramas* as contained in the *Mahābhārata* and *Dharmaśāstras* are dealt with in brief. The first stage in the life of every Aryan is Brahmacarya, and he entered that after *upanayana* (investiture with sacred thread) which was to be performed when the boy attained the age of seven or eight years. The pupil was to reside at the house of his preceptor and do household duties there in lieu of the payment of money.[1] He was to study there for twelve years and was under the complete supervision of his preceptor. Some pupils begged for their food, while some had their meals with their preceptor. Implicit obedience to the preceptor and doing menial service including massaging his feet etc, were some of their duties. The pupils had strictly to observe the rules of celibacy, to guard against the eight-fold *maithuna*, to abstain from physical luxuries of any sort such as spiced food, perfumes etc., to avoid all places of amusements and pleasure, and to restrain their senses. They tied their hair in a knot, bore a staff and girdle and wore a simple cloth. A few students were admitted on payment of their entire tuition fees in advance which generally amounted to one thousand pieces of money. These students were not required to do any household work. Pupils of the first three castes thus lived with their preceptor and got instruction. Kings and the rich people engaged the services of competent teachers for giving instruction to their sons and wards at their residence. Instruction was generally imparted by rote. After the prescribed course was completed the pupil made handsome gift to his preceptor and returned home. Samāvartana (return) marked the close of the period of studentship.

Subsequent to his coming back, the student entered

1 Cf. Mookerji, *Visvabharati Qtly.*, October 1928, p. 229.

the life of a householder after marrying a girl of his own caste. "Marriage Laws and Customs" are dealt with in detail in the next chapter. The first duty of a householder was to kindle the sacrificial fire and offer daily oblations to the fire. He had also to perform a number of religious and domestic rites and the *Gautamadharmasûtra* (VIII. 14-20) prescribes forty sacraments for a householder.

When a householder got old and had sons to shoulder the responsibility of worldly affairs he entered the life of a hermit (Vānaprastha) staying in a forest. He had to perform penances there, aloof from the din of the world.

Then finally came the last stage, Sannyāsa (asceticism), which was open only to the Brāhmaṇas. The life of an ascetic was one of hardship,—an ordeal. Some of the important rules are given here. The Sannyāsin had to live on begging. He was required to conquer his passions and have equanimity of mind under all circumstances. He was to regard all with equality. He was not to desire anything, nor to hoard anything, nor to have any attachment for anybody. He was to wander from place to place and not to stay at a place for more than a day.

We get the following information from Bhāsa as to the four orders *(āśramas)* and their duties.

After initiation, the Brāhmaṇa boy had to go to a preceptor for the study of the Vedas. It appears that the disciples were entrusted to the care of the tutor when quite young, and hence all the responsibility as to the physical, mental and intellectual development of the child rested with the tutor. It has rightly been observed, therefore, that should the pupil misbehave, the fault lies at the door not of his parents or friends, but of his teacher.[1] Residence at the house of a preceptor entailed the performance of manual labour such as accompanying him to the forest to fetch fuel, fruit, root, flowers, etc.[2] Among other holidays, one was observed on *aṣṭamī* when no instruction in the Vedas was to be given.[3] In this connection, it is interesting to note that the system of

1 *Pañc.* I. 21. 2 *Karṇa.* p. 78. कदाचित् फलमूलसमिदुद्धारणाय गतवता गुरुणा सहानुगतोऽसि। 3 *Cār.* p. 41.

granting holidays on certain fixed days known as *anadhyāya* seems to be post-Vedic. "Vedic study was compulsory", observes Prof. Venkatesvara, "and no day was regarded as a holiday except when the person of the student was impure ceremonially or by illness, or when there was impurity in the locality".[1] Like the black sheep in every fold, there were some students who were reluctant to put up with their preceptor and live the rigours of the celibate life. They looked with greatest joy to the day of the completion of their education (the *samāvartana* ceremony) after which they hastened home.[2] Ordinarily every pupil stayed with the preceptor till the completion of his course unless some extraordinary cause intervened.[3] Students paid some gifts (*dakṣiṇās*) to their *gurus* after the instructions were over. A fine instance of the high regard and devotion entertained by a pupil for his preceptor is supplied by Duryodhana who offers to give to his *guru* (Droṇa) not only everything that he possesses, but promises to procure the fulfilment of any desired object of his preceptor through his valour and mace. "So long as the mace rests in my hand", declares Duryodhana, "all is thine".[4]

High ideals of the life of the husband and wife are presented to us in the *Svapnavāsavadatta*, *Pratimā*, *Cārudatta*, etc, and a reference is made to them in the next chapter entitled "Marriage Laws and Customs". Oblations to household deities and to *mātṛkās* were among the daily duties of a householder.[5] A guest was worshipped, his feet were washed and he was honoured with the traditional Hindu hospitality. Both husband and wife joined in serving the guest.[6] Feeding the guest was taken equal in merit to the performance of a sacrifice.[7] Doors of a Hindu householder were always open to a guest.

Besides the persons who turned hermits (*parivrājakas*) in due course of time after performing

1 *Ind. Cult.*, I, p. 82; *Tait. Ār.* II. 14. 2 *Avi*, p. 73—किरसमावुत्तो वटुओ विअ तुवरसि। 3 *Svapna*, p. 26—सचनवसिता विद्या, किमागमनप्रयोजनम्।

4 *Pañc*, I. 31. स्वच्छन्दतो वद किमिच्छसि किं ददानि।
इस्ते स्थिता मम गदा भवतश्च सर्वम्॥

5 *Cār*, pp. 26, 36.—मातृकेभ्यो बलिः। देवकार्यम्। 6 *Prat*, p. 98. 7 *Avi*, p. 67—दट्ठुं भाअन्तुअस्स भोअणदाणं।

their duties as householders, there were some who undertook the life of a hermit after some great shock or after getting tired of life.[1] We get an instance of a female hermit *(tāpasi)* in the dowager queen of Magadha who resided in a hermitage just outside Rājagṛha. This single instance from Bhāsa does not entitle us to conclude that no barrier was placed in the way of females embracing asceticism.[2] The description of the hermitage would give some idea as to the peace and sanctity that reigned there. These hermitages were away from the din and bustle of the town and were cosmopolitan in nature. Every one was free to go there. They were the houses, as it were of the guests. The inmates there, who resided in huts, were all satisfied, having no worldly desires to be fulfilled. They wore bark-garments and lived on wild fruits, passing their time in meditation. The whole atmosphere around the hermitages breathed of freedom and abundance. The deer roamed about freely, the trees were full of flowers and fruits and there were a number of cows which supplied milk to the inmates. During midday and in the evening, there arose from the hermitage lines of smoke. Water also was to be had nearby, and the inmates used to plunge for their bath thrice a day.[3] According to Rhys Davids, in those days " the hermitages where the learning or the repeating of texts was unknown were the exceptions ".[4] Perhaps it may be that through the influence of Buddhism which included the Bhikkhunis in the sacred order, the hermitages of the Hindus also were mixed colonies of ascetics. Curiously enough, Vātsyāyana does not refer to the Vānaprasthas ; so it appears that this stage was going out of vogue by the fourth century A. D.[5]

There were two classes of religious mendicants, *Tāpasa* and *Parivrājaka*. Those staying in the hermitage belonged to the *Tāpasa* class, and the *Parivrājakas* moved from place to place either alone or in the company of their disciples.[6] The queen-mother of Darśaka belonged to the hermit *(Tāpasa)* class and Yaugandharāyaṇa in disguise to the wanderer *(Parivrājaka)* class.

---

1 Cf. Pradhan, *Chronology*, p. 246. 2 Sarup, *Vision*, Notes, p. 102. 3 *Svapna*, I. 3, 5, 12, 16 ; pp. 16, 20, 25, 26. 4 *Buddhist India*, p. 141. 5 Chakladar, *Social Life*, pp. 111-112. 6 Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 140-141.

It appears that these mendicants donned red garments. The institution of the red garmented mendicants, however, is not taken over from Buddhism but is of Hindu origin. The fact that Pāṇini (7th century B. C.) mentions Bhikṣu-sūtras signifies that the order existed even earlier. At the period we are dealing with, there were quite a number of people who embraced asceticism simply to fill up their bellies.[1] This shows a degeneration of the order inasmuch as the red garb was put on to cloak beggary and thus to earn livelihood in an apparently honourable fashion. Such degenerate monks were found among the Buddhists also.

---

1 *Nirgrantha*, I. 9 ; Cf. also *Ārya*, p. 85.

CHAPTER XII.

MARRIAGE LAWS AND CUSTOMS.

The institution of marriage is the next important factor of the social structure of the Hindus. The *Dharmasūtras*, *Smṛtis* and *epics* mention eight forms of marriage. There are three laws regulating marriage, viz. (1) endogamy, or marriage in one's own caste, (2) *gotra*-exogamy or marriage outside direct paternal line, and (3) *sapiṇḍa*-exogamy or marriage outside certain specified degrees of blood relations (*sapiṇḍas*)—paternal as well as maternal. *Anuloma* marriage or hypergamy, though not approved, was yet regarded as valid, and the issue born of such marriage was placed in an intermediate caste between that of its parents. There was no question of contravening the rules as to exogamy in the *Anuloma* marriage, as the other party was certainly beyond the prohibited relationship, being of a different caste altogether; but these marriages obviously broke the rule of endogamy. *Pratiloma* marriages have been strictly prohibited since ancient times and were looked down upon as invalid and illegal. The issues born of *Pratiloma* marriage were styled as Cāṇḍālas or Niṣādas and they were not included in the four castes.

At the time of the *Ṛgveda* there do not appear to have been any rules prohibiting intermarriages. On the contrary, we come across many marriages of the Ṛṣis with the Kṣatriyas and vice versa. The only restriction seems to have been against marriages with the Anāryas, Dāsas or Dasyus. There was no religious obligation that every girl must be married; allusions are to be met with in the *Ṛgveda* to unmarried girls staying with their fathers and

claiming and obtaining a share in the paternal property.[1] The marriage ceremony was celebrated at the house of the bride and was a simple affair. There are many references to careful and industrious wives possessed of all those domestic virtues for which the Hindu wife has always been noted, who supervised household affairs and like the celebrated *uṣās* (dawn) roused and sent every one in the house to his work in the morning.[2] Occasional references, however, are found to women going astray, to faithless wives, to maidens having no one to watch over their morals, to a ruined gambler's wife becoming the object of others' lust, etc.[3] The custom of child marriage was unknown in the Vedic times, and polygamy was the privilege of the kings and the rich people as it has always been in olden times in all countries and among all nations. There was no prohibition to the remarriages of widows.

It is in the *Dharmasūtras* that we first find mention of the eight (or six) different forms of marriage, which have been elaborated later on by the *Smṛtis*. Vasiṣṭha and Āpastamba recognized only six forms, viz., Brāhma, Daiva, Ārṣa, Gandharva, Kṣātra and Mānuṣa, the last two being respectively named Rākṣasa and Āsura by Āpastamba. The first three forms in the above list are regarded as praiseworthy in the Āpastamba. Gautama and Baudhāyana, the older Dharmasūtrakāras, however, mention eight forms of marriage, adding Prājāpatya and Paiśāca to the list, the former only being praiseworthy.[4] Thus we get four praiseworthy forms and four sinful forms of marriage. In a Brāhma marriage, the father of the bride poured out libations of water and gave away his daughter to a suitor, a student. The Daiva marriage consisted in the giving away of his bedecked daughter by her father to an officiating priest when a sacrifice was being performed. The father gave away his daughter for a cow or a bull in an Ārṣa marriage. The lover himself took away and wedded a loving damsel in the Gandharva form. Force was used in the Kṣātra (or Rākṣasa) marriage in which the bridegroom carried away a damsel destroying her relations by strength of arms. The Mānuṣa (or Āsura) marriage was a simple affair in which the suitor purchased a damsel from her father. In

1 *Rgveda*, II. 17. 7. 2 *Rgveda*, I. 124. 4. 3 *Rgveda*, II. 29. 1; IV. 5. X. 34. 4.; 4 Cf. Dutta, *Early Hindu Civilization*, pp. 254-255.

the Prājāpatya form, the father simply gave away his daughter to the suitor saying "Fulfil ye the law conjointly". The Paiśāca form was nothing more than a form of rape when a man embraced a woman deprived of consciousness.

The *Dharmasūtras* rigorously prohibited marriages among kinsfolk. The same *gotra* or *pravara* was excluded for purposes of marriage as also was the relationship within four degrees on the mother's side and six degrees on the father's side.[1] Baudhāyana, a southerner, allowed a man to marry the daughter of his maternal uncle or paternal aunt.[2] There were no child marriages in the period of the *Dharmasūtras* and remarriages were allowed only in the case of child widows.

Messengers were sent by the bridegroom to the father of the bride reciting *Ṛigveda* X. 85. 23, and if the proposal was acceptable to both, the promise of marriage was ratified and both parties touched a vessel containing flowers, fried grain, barley and gold. The bridegroom then performed a sacrifice. On the appointed day, the bride took bath in fragrant water and then, putting on newly dyed garments, sat down by the fire at the sacrifice. The bridegroom also bathed and went through auspicious ceremonies and was escorted to the girl's house by young women (who were not widows). The actual marriage ceremony varied in detail in different localities but the essentials were the same. The bridegroom holding the bride by the hand led her thrice round the fire reciting some verses. The bride sacrificed to the fire *lājā* or fried grain, which her brother or guardian had put in her hands. The bridegroom then caused the bride to step forward seven paces reciting suitable words. This going round the fire, sacrificing the *lājās* and the pacing of seven steps constituted the principal ceremonies of marriage. The couple then sat silent till the Polar Star appeared, and then the husband showed it to his wife saying "Firm be you, thriving with me". The wife replied, "I see the Polar Star; may I obtain offspring".[3] Then began the married life of the couple.

The *Mahābhārata* also mentions eight forms of

1 Cf. *Vasiṣṭha*, VIII. 1 and 2; *Āpastamba*, II. 5. 11. 15, 16. 2 *Baudhāyana*, 1. 1. 2. 4. 3 Dutta, *op cit.*, pp. 260-261.

marriage, but speaks of five as being current.[1] Brāhma, Kṣātra, Gāndharva, Āsura and Rākṣasa were in vogue of which the last two were regarded as sinful. Brāhma in those days perhaps included Daiva and Ārṣa of the Sūtra times. The Brāhma was specially recommended for the Brāhmaṇas and it consisted in the offering of the bride to the bridegroom after honouring him with gifts, money, etc. The Kṣātra was prescribed for both the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas, but the manner has not been stated. Mr. Vaidya thinks that in the Kṣātra marriages the bride was offered to one who successfully accomplished the condition laid down by the father of the bride.[2] The Gāndharva form, which was so named as it was current among the Gandharvas on the Himālayas, was love marriage in which the bride had full power to choose the bridegroom of her liking. This form was prescribed mainly for the Kṣatriyas. Of the two condemned forms, the Āsura was the purchase of the bride by paying large sums of money to her relatives or to the bride herself. It was current among the Kekayas and the Madras at the period of the *Mahābhārata*. In the Rākṣasa marriage the bride was forcibly taken away in spite of her protests after fighting with her relatives and slaying them. Though the bride was accepted in any of the above forms, the regular marriage ceremony was celebrated in the Brāhma form.[3] The *Saptapadī* round the fire set the final seal and gave religious sanction to the marriage ceremony.

As regards the laws of marriage in the age of the *Mahābhārata*, the male of each caste was allowed to marry a female of the same caste or of the lower caste or castes. Though the Brāhmaṇa could thus marry a woman of the Śūdra caste, such marriages were censured and regarded as sinful. Vṛṣalīpati (the Brāhmaṇa husband of a Śūdra wife) was considered as unworthy of officiating at the *śrāddhas* or of accepting gifts. The offspring of such intermarriages was taken to belong to the caste of its father. Later on, such offspring was taken to belong to a

1 *Mahābhārata*, I. 74. 8-9.

ब्राह्मो दैवस्तथैवार्षः प्राजापत्यस्तथासुरः ॥८॥
गान्धर्वो राक्षसश्चैव पैशाचश्चाष्टमः स्मृतः ।

Cf. also. *Mahābhārata* XIII. 44.

2 *Upasaṁhāra*, p. 217. 3 Cf. Vaidya, *Upasaṁhāra*, pp. 216-221.

caste lower than that of its father. Then marriages only within one's own caste were praised. *Pratiloma* marriages never received any sanction and were always condemned.

There were no child marriages in the *Mahābhārata* age also. The baneful custom originated with the *Dharmaśāstras*. Like the *Sūtras* the *Mahābhārata* was also in favour of the remarriage of child widows. Polygamy was, as ever, in vogue in those days.

Reference must also be made here to the custom of *Niyoga* which prevailed in ancient India in common with similar customs among ancient people. The practice was for a childless widow to have intercourse with the brother or any near kinsman of her deceased husband to raise up issue to him, the son so born being called *Kṣetraja*. The practice of *Niyoga* arose probably owing to the desire to have male issue to the deceased to add to the number of the constituents of any society, as in ancient times the strength of a society depended on its number. The restrictions were that only childless widows or childless women whose husbands were incapable for some reason to beget sons could take advantage of the practice if permitted by their husbands or near relatives. The person to be selected for *Niyoga* was to be the brother of the husband or any other near relative or an honoured sage, so that *savarṇa* and strong and capable progeny was ensured ; and as the begetting of a son was the main purpose of the practice, the sanction terminated as soon as a son was born. All the same, the practice of *Niyoga* was an exceptional one and did not survive long. It fell into disuse later on when there was growth of population and countries were thickly populated, and the system (of *Niyoga*) conflicted with the ideas of chastity (*pātivratya*) of women which arose among the Aryans in India. In the Bhārata age, we find that Pāṇḍu and Dhṛtarāṣṭra, as well as the five Pāṇḍavas were born of *Niyoga*. There are no instances of *Niyoga* in later times, and the system was condemned by the *Dharmaśāstras* as improper and sinful in the Kali age.[1]

As regards marriage in the Buddhist period, we find that usually there were three forms of marriage, viz., (1)

1 Cf. Vaidya, *Upasaṁhāra*, 204-206. It is interesting to note in this connection that Kautilya allows *Niyoga* even in the case of Brāhmaṇas, III. 6 (p. 163) cf. also I. 17 (p. 35). Contra, *Manu*, IX. 57-68.

marriage arranged by guardians, (2) Svayaṁvara, and (3) Gāndharva marriage, the first being the common form. Guardians of both parties, generally of the same caste and of equal rank, arranged marriages of their wards, which were akin to the Prājāpatya form referred to above. In the Svayaṁvara form, a girl publicly chose a husband for herself from amongst a number of suitors assembled in a *Svayaṁvara-sabhā* convened for the purpose. The Gāndharva form was love marriage in which the bride and the bridegroom selected each other without the knowledge of their relatives and no rites or ceremonies solemnized their marriage. Sometimes, there were marriages with seduced or abducted women.[1] The marriage ceremony was celebrated on an auspicious day. The *Jātakas* and the Dhammapāda commentary show that marriage of girls was celebrated with bath-money coming from their father. On the occasion of marriage the father of the bride gave her some village or treasures as bath and perfume money (nahānamūlam, nhāna cunnamūlam).[2]

It appears there were no child marriages in the Buddhist period, the marriageable age of a girl was taken to be sixteen.[3] The royalty and the rich people as usual in all countries practised polygamy. There was no prohibition against bigamy and jealousies and quarrels of co-wives are referred to. Remarriage of women was not unkown in that period and widow remarriage was not infrequent. Divorces which are unknown in Hindu marriages were allowed without any formal decree. The Hindu Law of exogamy was disregarded by the Buddhists. Even setting aside the story of sister marriage as unhistorical the idea itself being revolting to the Indians from ancient times, we find in the Buddhist works references to a number of cousin marriages which appear to have been usual.[4]

Kauṭilya, in common with the *Dharmaśāstras* and the epics, mentions eight forms of marriage, four of which, *viz.*, Brāhma, Prājāpatya, Ārṣa and Daiva were preferable being ancestral customs of old, and required the sanction of only the father. The remaining four forms, *viz.*,

1 Cf. B. C. Law, *IHQ*, II. pp. 565-569; K. A. Padhye, *JASBOM*, XV. pp. 58-59. 2 *Dhammapāda Commentary*, Pāli Text Society. Vol. III, p. 266; also *Jātakas* Nos. 239, 283. 3 Jā. Nos. 126, 262, 477; *Dhammapāda com.* II. 217. 4 Jā. Nos. 26, 193, 262.

Gāndharva, Āsura, Rākṣasa and Paiśāca required the sanction of both the father and the mother. That the progeny of Anuloma marriages was known by different caste names and was entitled only to maintenance from the estate of its father shows that such marriages were not approved. Pratiloma marriages were condemned and the sons begotten therefrom were said to originate from the king's violating his *dharma*.[1] The enumeration of different kinds of Pratiloma sons does not necessarily signify their existence in those days. The *Arthaśāstra* being the work of an encyclopædic character has included in the list every conceivable thing concerning different kinds of sons which was merely of academic interest, to give thoroughness to the book. In the age of the *Arthaśāstra* as also the Buddhist age, we come across some marriages among persons of different nationalities, the marriage of Candragupta Maurya with a Hellenic princess, daughter of Seleucus Nicator, serving as a glaring instance, which tend to show that there were no barriers to such marriages.

In the *Dharmaśāstras* or the *Smṛtis* we come across the same eight forms of marriage as the *Dharmasūtras* mention. Paiśāca and Āsura are strongly condemned as also the practice of receiving gratuity or nuptial fee for the daughter. The marriage age of girls has been much lowered by the *Smṛtis* and the celebrated *nagnikā* rule which held its sway till recent times on the general Hindu populace makes its first appearance in the *Smṛtis*. The *nagnikā* rule ordained that the best age for the marriage of a girl was when she could go on naked and was immature *viz.*, eight. Some *Smṛtis* even went to the length of attaching great sin to the parents of girls who remained unmarried till the age of puberty. Marriages between relations (*sagotra* and *sapiṇḍa* marriages referred to above) were strictly prohibited by the *Smṛtis*. Widow remarriage was strictly condemned. Anuloma marriages though not approved were allowed, but the *Smṛtis* were deadly against Pratiloma marriages.[2] The difference between the attitudes towards the Anuloma and Pratiloma will be evident from the punishments prescribed for illicit connections of that nature ; whereas a Śūdra having illicit

1 *Arthaśāstra*, III. 2, 5-7 (pp. 151-154 ; 160-165). 2 Cf. *Manusmṛti*, III. 12-19 ; X. 6 ff.

connection with high caste women was condemned to death, illicit connection with Śūdra women was merely punished.[1] Throughout the whole period down from the Vedic time we find that the *saptapadī* was regarded as the most essential part of the marriage ceremony. It is interesting to note in this connection that even now, according to the Hindu Law, a marriage is valid and binding only after both parties have stepped seven paces ; till then it is imperfect and revocable.[2]

Now, turning to the plays of Bhāsa, we find in them marriages exemplifying the following forms: Brāhma, Kṣātra, Gāndharva, Rākṣasa and Āsura. The marriage between Padmāvatī and Vatsarāja in the *Svapnavāsavadatta* was in the most approved form (*i.e.*, Brāhma), since king Darśaka (brother of Padmāvatī) himself offered the hand of his sister to Vatsarāja.[3] As king Kāśirāja had sent an emissary to king Kuntibhoja for the hand of the latter's daughter in marriage for his son Jayavarman, the marriage between prince Jayavarman and Sumitrā belongs to the Kṣātra form.[4] The love marriage between Avimāraka and Kuraṅgī naturally falls under the Gāndharva form. The match between Udayana and Vāsavadattā was cemented by love and hence, as stated by king Mahāsena, the father of Vāsavadattā, their marriage was under the Gāndharva form.[5] It may, however, also be taken to come under the Rākṣasa form as Vāsavadattā was forcibly captured by Udayana. The marriage between Daśaratha and Kaikeyī is neither mentioned in the *Pratimā* nor does it form the principal part of the *Pratimā* ; but as there was a contract in the marriage to pay dowry (*śulka*) it comes under the Āsura form.[6] The relations between Sajjalaka and Madanikā, and Cārudatta and Vasantasenā suggest Anuloma marriages.

Brāhma and Kṣātra marriages. For a regular marriage between the Kṣatriyas, envoys and priests used to be sent to the father of the bride. References are found to the despatch of envoys (*dūtasampāta*) by Pradyota on behalf of his son to the court of the Magadha king for the hand of Padmāvatī and by various kings for the hands of

1 Viswanatha, *Racial Synthesis*, p. 144. 2 Chunilal vs. Surajram, 33 Bom. 433, Anthikesavalu vs. Ramanujam, 32 Mad. 512 ; Brindavan vs. Chandra 12 Cal. 140. 3 *Svapna*, p. 48. 4 *Avi*, pp. 10, 11, 106, 107. 5 *Pratijñā*, p. 72 ; also *Svapna*, p. 133. 22 6 *Pratimā*, I. 15.—शुल्के विपणिते राज्यम्।

Vāsavadattā and Kuraṅgī.[1] Marriages were contracted after considering and examining the problem from various aspects. The main factor in the view of the bride's father was the family of the bridegroom evidently for the sake of according with the rules of endogamy. The bride's father desired a celebrated family for the bridegroom. The next considerations were the qualities of the head and heart of the bridegroom. Preference was given to one with a sympathetic and soft heart. Then came the beauty of physical form, not from any inherent merit in it, but that the bride's father was required to look to the features of the bridegroom to save himself from the criticism of the women-folk on the bride's side. Strength and valour in a bridegroom also counted for much, as he was required to be sufficiently powerful to protect his bride.[2] In addition to the consideration of merits in a bridegroom, the surrounding circumstances, political expediency and other eventualities were also taken into account, and then marriages were arranged avoiding undue haste and undue procrastination.[3] One golden rule about the selection of a bridegroom is stated to be 'marry your daughter where there would be no cause for repentance'.[4] Vātsyāyana also formulates the same general rule when he advises: 'marry the girl that will make you happy.'[5] Bride's parents consulted each other in regard to the selection of a son-in-law, and not only did the mother exercise her right in the affair, but her view carried weight with her husband. The marriages of Vāsavadattā and Kuraṅgī were postponed in deference to the wishes of their mothers.[6] It appears that the brides had some voice in the selection of their husbands.[7]

The marriage ceremony used to be celebrated at the house of the bride's father.[8] Kautukamaṅgala was a pre-nuptial rite of tying a piece of thread on the wrist. It was to be performed on an auspicious day. A garland

---

1 *Svapna*, p. 17 ; *Pratijñā*, II. 8, pp. 28-29 ; *Avi*, pp. 10-11. There was an exception in the case of Udayana's marriage with Padmāvatī. Padmāvatī's brother himself offered her to Udayana when the latter had been to Rājagṛha on some other mission, without any messenger coming from Udayana.—*Svapna*, pp. 47-49. 2 *Pratijñā*, II. 4. 3 *Avi*, pp. 10-11. 4 *Pratijñā*, p. 29.—जहिं दइअ ण सन्तप्पामो तहि दीअहु । 5 Chakladar, *Social Life*, p. 120. 6 *Pratijñā*, p. 38 ; *Avi*, pp. 38-39. 7 *Svapna*, p. 43.—महिदारिआ तेण रण्णा सह सम्बन्धे णेच्छदि । ; *Avi*, p. 38.—अहं अत्तणो पमाणं । 8 Cf. the marriages of Padmāvatī, Sumitrā and Kuraṅgī with Udayana, Jayavarman and Avimāraka.

named Kautukamālā was put round her neck by the bride on this day, and, among other things, a particular herb credited with bringing in permanent prosperity and warding off calamities was generally entwined in the garland. There was also another herb to be employed in the garland reputed to ruin the co-wives.[1] The palms of the bride were dyed red for marriage, as also were her parted hair.[2] The female relatives of the bride went to receive the bridegroom who came in a specially fashioned car.[3] Young women, who were not widows, escorted the bridegroom to the sacred fire for the marriage ceremony.[4]

There does not appear any reference to the influence of horoscopes and other astrological fads of which much was made in later times in settling a marriage. The priests only looked for an auspicious constellation on the day of marriage. The marriage ceremony was performed in right royal fashion with all the pomp and glory of decorations, ornaments, festivities and feasts.[5]

Gāndharva. Gāndharva, as already stated, is love marriage with consent. It has been described as 'concubinage' by the Allahabad High Court;[6] but the form was none the less valid and prevailed among the Kṣatriyas. The religious ceremonies performed subsequently, it is submittted, gave it a sanctity and sanction. The term now denotes remarriage among lower classes. In Bhāsa's time religious rites were thought necessary to perfect the Gāndharva (and Rākṣasa, if we include Vāsavadattā's marriage in this category) marriage. Thus, though Avimāraka and Kuraṅgī were already united by the Gāndharva form, their marriage was celebrated in the presence of fire.[7] The king of Avanti also performed the marriage ceremony of his daughter after her elopement, portraits being used in place of the bride and bridegroom, both being physically unavailable.[8] This implies that ceremonies essential to the validity of a marriage, such as the invocation before the sacred fire and the *saptapadi*, were almost invariably performed in each and every marriage. The marriage of Daśaratha

1 *Svapna*, pp. 55-57. 2 *Svapna*, p. 40—अभिमसंजामएआ etc.; Cf. Woolner and Sarup, *13 Trivandrum Plays*, I, p. 47g 2. 3 *Ūru*, St. 9.—जामादरं पवहणादिव वन्धुनारीः। 4 *Svapna*, p. 57.—अविहवादि 5 *Svapna*, pp. 59-60. 6 Bhaoni vs. Maharajsing, 3 All. 738. 7 *Avi*, p. 103. 8 *Pratijñā* p. 72; *Svapna*, p. 133.

and Kaikeyī, though not referred to in our plays, was also celebrated according to *dharma*. Thus we may conclude that in all forms of marriages the religious ceremonies were performed according to the Brāhma form after the carrying away of the bride by the bridegroom.

The marriage of Avimāraka is important to us from the fact of its disregarding the rule of *sapiṇḍa* exogamy or consanguinity. In the Vedic times and the Buddhist age, as we have already seen, marriages with cognatic relations to the third degree were recognized.[1] We have also seen that the *Dharmasūtras* and the *Smṛtis* fixed the limit, prohibiting marriages with maternal relations to the fifth (or seventh) degrees and paternal relations to the seventh degree. Now, in the *Avimāraka*, we find that the prince is marrying his maternal uncle's daughter, who was at the same time his paternal aunt's daughter.[2] Marriage with a maternal uncle's daughter is not uncommon on this side, being recognized by Baudhāyana and approved by local custom. Marriage with a paternal aunt's daughter, however, being rather uncommon and being with the third generation, suggests a fairly old time, before the composition of the *Smṛtis*, which accords well with the time we have assigned to these plays.

Finally, we come to the Anuloma marriage or hypergamy. Such marriages, as we have seen, though not approved were recognized. As we have already observed, these marriages were common in ancient times but were not favoured later on when the caste system held sway over the populace. By the time of Vātsyāyana intercaste marriages were gradually growing unpopular, and Vātsyāyana prescribed marriage only with a girl of the

---

1 *Hindu Exogamy*, p. 14. 2 The relationship will be clear from the following table;

(S=son; D=daughter; M=married; Br. Brother).



Avimāraka and Jayavarman were respectively married to Kuraṅgī and Sumitrā.

same caste. Love was permissible according to Vātsyāyana with maidens of other castes, but not marriage.[1] Cārudatta and Sajjalaka were Brāhmaṇas and they fell in love with courtesans who evidently did not belong to their castes. We are not told whether any ceremonies were performed or whether any special form was necessary to legalize these marriages.

It is contended on the strength of stray uses of the word "*Sambandha*" in some of the plays that *sambandha* marriages current in South India are referred to in these plays.[2] The argument is put forth to cast doubt on the authenticity of the plays and to show their southern origin and late date. Now, at all the places where the word *sambandha* is taken to refer to *sambandha* marriages, we find that the word is used in its simple sense of 'relationship' and not the technical sense which is sought to be attached to the word.[3] Yet owing to the importance of the problem we deem it necessary to consider the point here. We are obliged to Mr. K. G. Sankar for enlightening us on the '*sambandha* marriage'. "*Sambandha* is neither more nor less", writes he, "than civil marriage with right of divorce. The presentation of a cloth by the *vara* to the *vadhū* with a social dinner constitutes the entire ritual. No Sanskrit *mantras* are recited and Anuloma intercaste marriages are permitted, and the wife has the status of a legal wife, but she does not share the religious life of her husband and the husband does not interdine with his wife. The children of such marriage take the mother's caste. This is the popular form of marriage in Malabar except in the case of Brāhmaṇa women."[4] Applying these requisites to the marriages of Vāsavadattā and Kuraṅgī which are alleged to be *sambandha* marriages, we find that neither can be styled as such by any stretch of imagination on any account. Both the husband and wife in these instances belong to the same caste, *i.e.*, they are Kṣatriyas, and their marriages are performed with religious ceremonies in the presence of fire with the chanting of *mantras*. There is again no question of the husband not interdining with the wife or the status of the

1 Cf. Chakladar, *Social Life*, pp. 116, 117, 119. 2 S. Kuppuswami Sastri, *Udaya*, Intr., pp. 26-27. 3 *Pratijñā*, pp. 33, 34, 37, 73; *Svapna*, p. 43; *Avi.* 4 Letter dated 14-8-1932. Sambandha marriages are recognised in law if they are registered under the Malabar Marriage Act.—Kelkar and Khare, *Hindu Law* (in Marathi) p. 83.

children of such marriage, in the case of the two marriages under consideration as they are regular *savarṇa* marriages with Vedic rites. Further, there is absolutely no idea of the right of divorce in these old marriages. The idea is quite foreign, and we may say repugnant to the nature of either of the above princesses or their husbands in particular, and to the society of that period in general.

Looking to the character and description of the princesses, we are inclined to think that they were quite grown up and that there were no child marriages in those days.[1] In fact, as we have seen, the practice of child marriage is of quite a late origin in India. At the time of Vātsyāyana, marriages both before or after puberty were equally common.[2] Polygamy was then, as it is even now, a fashion among kings and rich persons. Monogamy seems to be generally prevalent among the commoners. There is to be found no reference to remarriages of widows or to divorce, and hence we cannot say anything about the view of the society in these matters at that time.

High ideals of the life of a husband and a wife are placed before us in the characters of the *Svapnavāsavadatta*, *Pratimā*. *Cārudatta*, etc. Both husband and wife respected each other. The husband was the lord and protector of the wife, and the wife was half his body to the husband,—the mistress of his household.[3] It was the prime duty of a wife to follow her lord through thick and thin in spite of any defects in him, just as Tārā follows the Moon in spite of its eclipse by Rāhu, or as a creeper falls to the ground when its supporting tree tumbles down, or as the female elephant who does not abandon her mate though stuck into the mire.[4] Attendance on elders, especially the parents of the husband also comprised one of the duties of his wife.[5] Her sole aim was the happiness of the husband and for the sake of ensuring it she sacrificed her personal likes and dislikes. She even consented to his marriage with another lady if that contributed to his good in the end.[6] Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī, as already observed, supply us with the ideals of polygamy where the co-wives act as sisters and vie with each other in

---

1 Cf. Vāsavadattā, Kuraṅgī and Padmāvatī. 2 Chakladar, *Social Life*, pp. 125, 126. 3 *Prat*, I. 10 —'शरीरार्धेन'; *Bāl*, p. 10.—'गेहस्सणी' 4 *Prat*, I. 25. 5 *Prat*, p. 33; *Pratijñā*, p. 9. 6 Cf. Vāsavadattā in the *Svapna*.

their love and regard for their husband. There is no trace in our plays of the petty jealousies and quarrels of co-wives or of the unfaithful and unchaste women portrayed in the Buddhist writings. No sacrifice was considered too great for the sake of the husband, and the wife of poor Cārudatta at once parts with her valuable pearl necklace, the gift from her relatives, after hearing of the theft and the sorry plight of her husband.[1] Sītā, though pure of body and heart, consents to undergo the fire ordeal to satisfy her lord. To a faithful, chaste and devoted wife her husband was her all-in-all, and his wish or desire was her sacred code of conduct.[2] It was thought improper for a woman either to see a stranger or even to hear his praise.[3] A man also avoided the sight of other women and was responsible for the welfare and happiness of his wife.[4] In Vatsarāja we have a considerate husband full of love for his dead wife. Rāma and Sītā from an ideal couple, preaching by their example respect to elders, devotion to each other, sacrifice for husband's sake, etc.

In short, in the characters of these plays we get perfect husbands and wives; there is nothing supernatural about them; they are thoroughly human,—men and women of this world.

---

1 *Cār.*, pp. 83-86. 2 *Mv.*, p. 13.—पतिमतपत्नीषु पतिन्यदपि नाम। 3 *Svapna.* pp. 26, 55, 136. 4 *Avi.*, p. 10; *Svapna.* p. 25.

CHAPTER XIII.

POSITION OF WOMEN.

It has rightly been said that the culture and civilization of a period can be gauged from the treatment accorded to women. In the Vedic period much latitude was given to the fair sex. There were a number of cultured ladies who were themselves Ṛṣis and composed hymns and performed sacrifices like men. No restrictions were placed on their legitimate spheres of action, and women freely spoke to people gathered at their houses, went to feasts, took part in sacrifices, gaily decorated and decked with ornaments.[1] There was no religious obligation that every girl must be married, and they were allowed to follow Brahmacarya like men. They inherited and possessed property. They distinguished themselves in learning and sciences of that period and took part in learned disquisitions.

In the epic period also we find that women were held in high respect and no special restrictions or disabilities were placed in the way of women only on account of their sex. They wielded a considerable influence in social and political matters.

The Buddhists, however, looked to women with suspicion, and disparaging remarks about them are met everywhere in the *Jātaka* stories. Women are said to be depravity incarnate. They are unknowable and uncertain as the path of the fish in water. They are faithless, ungrateful, treacherous and untrustworthy. It is said that a woman cannot be guarded; there is no keeping her safe.

---

1 Cf. Majumdar, *Outline*, p. 47.

They are difficult to control.[1] The *Kuṇāla Jātaka* is intended to illustrate the vices and follies of womankind, their immoderate passion, unchastity and lust. Buddha was reluctant to admit women in his Order, but he ultimately gave his consent to their admission. All the above remarks about women do not reflect the correct state of the society, nor are they to be taken at their face value. They are purposely coloured and are intended as warnings to lustful monks to beware of women and save themselves from falling into the snares of women. The *Jātaka* and other Buddhist works show the lax morality in their sacred Order; but judging from the contemporary writings of other faiths, it does not appear that women had suddenly clothed themselves in all vices specially in the Buddhist period. There were, of course, black sheep in every fold as is the case everywhere.

The *Arthaśāstra* does not throw much light on the position of women in those days. Their right over property is recognized and some consideration is shown to them under certain circumstances.[2] They are found to be helpful in the secret service. No particular restrictions are placed on women taking any legitimate course of action.

The *Smṛti* writers, Manu, for instance, in spite of the noble sentiments of ancient writers about the high position of women echoed in their works, enunciate at times, the fundamental doctrine of women's perpetual subjugation and dependence on the males and differentiate between the status of husband and wife.[3] The commentators on the *Smṛtis* and later Nibandhakāras ignore the noble words and wax eloquent on the restrictions to be placed on women and their incompetence and incapacities.

The period under our review is, however, characterized by a spirit of toleration towards women. The birth of a female child was an honour and an occasion for great joy and not of sorrow as expressed in later writings.[4] No specific particulars about the education

---

1 *Jā*, I. 143; III. 527; IV. 425; Cf. also I. 61, 65, 145; II. 198, 198, 263; III. 360; *Kuṇāla. Jātaka* (V. 536). 2 Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, III. 3, 4, pp. 154-162. 3 *Manu*, III. 55-60; contra *Manu*, IX. 2, 3. न स्त्री स्वातन्त्र्यमर्हति। 4 *Avi*, I. 9.–कन्यापितुर्बहु वन्दनीयम्। Cf. *Avi*, I. 2. कन्यापितुर्हि सततं बहु चिन्तनीयम्।Contra. दारिका ह्रदयदारिका पितुः; जातेति कन्या महती हि शल्कु; etc.

of women are to be found in these plays. We know that in the Vedic age as also in the period of the epics, the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Jātakas*, literacy prevailed among women. As Brahmacarya was the period of education of the males, females also received instruction during this period, from women teachers.[1]

Maidens enjoyed perfect freedom at their parent's house. They passed their time in the company of their friends in playing the game of ball and in similar jolly pastimes. They also grew different kinds of shrubs in their gardens, and had parrots, peacocks, etc., as their playmates.[2] In addition to the three R's, they were apparently taught song and music.[3] Female teachers were apparently engaged for this purpose. From the fact that girls of high families received training in dancing, it appears that it was not thought an improper art among high circles.[4] In later times song, music and dance, especially the last one, came to be associated only with the prostitutes. Maidens moved freely in the public and used no covering over their heads which elderly women generally wore.[5] The sight of a maiden was thought to be free from the taint that was attached to the sight of a woman.[6]

The position of married women and the high respect they were held in by their husbands and other relatives has already been considered. Women lived in the inner apartments (*antaḥpura*) of the house and no stranger got entry inside. Even women of questionable character were not allowed.[7] Married women undertook a number of fasts, religious observances (*vratas*) and penances (*niyamas*) and gave *dakṣiṇās* to the Brāhmaṇas for the welfare of their husbands.[8]

Practically no information is supplied about the toilet of women in those days. It appears that married

---

1 Venkateswara, *Ind. Cult.*, I, Chap. III; Law, *OC*, IV, pp. 383-399; Mookerji, *Vidyabharati Qtly.*, I, pp. 227-241; Chakladar, *Social Life*, pp. 180-181; *Arthaśāstra*, III. 3. 2 Cf. Padmāvati and Vāsavadattā in the *Svapna* and *Pratijñā*; Kuṇāgi in the *Avi*. 3 Cf. Uttarā Vaitālikā in *Pratijñā* (p. 27) and Bṛhannalā in *Paṅc*. 4 *ADC*, p. 163. Baudhāyana, however, condemns music etc.—*Indian Cult.*, I, p. 300. 5 *Pratijñā*, p. 50—अवणीदकन्तुआए सिविआए·····। 6 *Pratijñā*, p. 50—कण्णमादंसणं गिहीसं...। 7 *Cār*, p. 56—अमाइणी वाइं अब्भन्तरप्पवेसस्स ण; Also p. 70—बाह्मजनधारितमन्तेउरं गृहजनो न द्रक्ष्यति। 8 *Cār*, p. 5 (अभिरूपपति) p. 84 (चंडी उपवास) *Avi*, p. 9 (नियमकार्ये); *Mṛ*. p. 11.

women braided their hair in three plaits when living with their husbands and only one plait when their husbands were away. They put on powder decoration in the parting of their hair and painted their forehead and cheeks, and put collyrium in their eyes. When her husband went abroad, the wife remained, as it were, in mourning. No toilet was used. No collyrium was put in the eyes nor were the hair combed.[1]

We do not get exact particulars as to how widows were treated. It seems probable that they were excluded on auspicious occasions.[2] They dressed themselves differently from women whose husbands were living.[3] Possibly, widows did not use ornaments and toilet, and it was taken to be inauspicious for a maiden not to decorate herself.[4]

There was a class of women in those times known as *goṣṭhijanas*, who were gay, cultured, talented and possessed great conversational powers. They were quite distinct from prostitutes. Possibly, such *goṣṭhijanas* were employed in royal palaces or at the houses of the rich in order to amuse the ladies.[5]

The fact of the queen Pauravī of Duryodhana expressing a desire to follow her lord to the funeral pyre is only incidentally mentioned.[6] It cannot sufficiently warrant the conclusion as to the prevalence of the custom of *sati* (or the burning of the widow on the pyre of her husband) in those days or the contrary. There is no reference to the burning of widows in the *Ṛgveda*. The word '*agre*' in *Ṛgveda* X.18.7 was changed to '*agne*' to justify the custom of *sati* which came into vogue at a later time.[7] In the *Mahābhārata*, we find that queen Mādrī burnt herself on her husband's funeral pyre. Greek historians also testify to the currency of the system among the Kathians, who have been identified with the people of

---

1 *Svapna*, V. 10—नेत्रविधौषिताञ्जनम् and दीर्घालकम्; *Abh.* II. 8—एकवेणीम्।
2 *Svapna*, p. 57. 3 *Dyh*, p. 52—भज्जबालिमे च दे वेसग्गहण अहं वि उवधारइस्सामि।
4 *Avi*, p. 54—मा अमङ्गलं भणाहि। सददालहिदा भट्टिदारिआ होदु। 5 Venkateswara, *Ind. Cult.*, I, p. 294; *Avi*, IV. 21; also pp. 54, 56, 86, 87. Prof. Chakladar takes *Goṣṭhi* to refer to "Social gatherings".—*Social Life*, pp. 164–167. We have referred to that sense of *goṣṭhi* in a later chapter. 6 *Ūru*, p. 109.—एक्कदिणवेसणिग्गआ। 7 Cf. *Ṛgveda*, X. 18. 7—आरोहन्तु जनयः योनिं अग्ने (or अग्नेः)। May these ladies *(janayaḥ)* be the first *(agre)* to ascend *(ārohantu)* the house *(yonim)*;—or may these ladies enter funeral pyre *(agneḥ yonim)*.

Madra. The reference in the *Mahābhārata* to the voluntary burning of the widows of Kṛṣṇa has been taken by Mr. Vaidya to be a later addition. The fact that the *Mahābhārata* does not mention the burning of the widows of Duryodhana and of others signifies that the custom did not prevail at the time of the Bhārata war. Mr. Dutta's opinion that the custom came into vogue in India after the Scythian invasion in the 2nd century B. C. stands disproved on the testimony of Greek writers coming before that invasion.[1] Owing to the solitary reference in our plays, no conclusion can be drawn one way or the other regarding the observance of the custom.

We do not get much information as to the dress and ornaments of women. The dress of women appears to have been two oblong pieces of cloth, one an upper garment (*uttarīya*) and the other, a lower garment. The upper garment practically covered the whole body of women, and was usually taken over the head so as to be used as a veil when necessary. This system of dress prevailed in the epic period and was perhaps current when these plays were written. The garments used by widows were white, while other women wore coloured garments. The reference to white-robed ladies in the *Mahābhārata* is perhaps the earliest passage, according to Prof. Visvanatha, referring to the wearing of white garments by the widows, a custom continued to this day.[2] Women, as ever, were very fond of ornaments and they used to wear a number of ornaments in ancient times made of gold, jewels, diamonds and pearls which were abundant in those times. The middle class people used silver and gold. Women wore anklets (*nūpura*) round their feet and a girdle (*raśanā*) round the waist. Then there were ear ornaments (*kuṇḍalas*) and bracelets (*keyūras*) for the arms. Some women used the sprout of the Tālī tree to grace the ear similar to the use of Śirīṣa.[3] Various kinds of necklaces made of different varieties of pearls, jewels, corals, etc. reaching the navel used to adorn their necks. No mention is found of the nose ring which unwidowed married women wear at present.

There is a difference of opinion about the prevalence

1 Vaidya, *Epic India*, pp. 91-92. 2 *Racial Synthesis*, p. 98. 3 *Cf. Cār*, p. 82.—(कर्णौ स्पृशु) इदि । तालीपत्रं सु पद ।

of the purdah system in ancient India before the system was introduced by the Mohamedans. Whatever scholars may say with regard to the subsequent periods, they are at one in stating that there was no purdah system in the Vedic age down to the period of the epics. Both in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* we come across passages that suggest at first sight that the purdah system was current in the epic period. The *Rāmāyaṇa* states: VI. 114. 28

व्यसनेषु न कृच्छ्रेषु न युद्धेषु स्वयंवरे।
न क्रतौ नो विवाहे वा दर्शनं दूष्यते स्त्रियः॥

The stanza is taken to mean that the purdah system which existed in those days was done away with on the six specified occasions. The stanza, however, states the exceptions to the general rule that no one was to look at women (अयुक्तं परकलत्रदर्शनम्) ; thus, according to the stanza, no sin was to be attached if one had a look at women on the six specified occasions. Had the custom of veiling women been generally approved and thought desirable, there would be no propriety in specifying the exceptions. And again we find descriptions of women going about unveiled. As regards the *Mahābhārata*, Mr. Vaidya has dealt in detail with the problem of the existence of the system in that age and has rightly come to the conclusion that the system was not in existence in the *Mahābhārata* period. The system, according to him, was borrowed by the Indians from the Persians in the 5th or the 4th century B. C., and prevailed in Northern India among the Kṣatriyas since that time.[1]

From the description of the galleries (*simhapañjara*) to the houses from where women had a glance at the processions and the fact that they went to religious discourses etc., Prof. C. V. Joshi concludes that the system was not found favour with in the Buddhist age.[2]

The general impression created by the *Arthaśāstra* is that the purdah system as such was unknown in those days. Dr. Mookerji, however, refers to the Zenana system or the seclusion of women in the *Arthaśāstra*; the references allude only to women who do not stir out of the

1 *Upasaṁhāra*, pp. 228-229. 2 *Aravinda*, 1921, pp. 349-350. The learned Professor has written in reply to a letter that now he has changed his view as he finds it to be based on insufficient data.

house.[1] So at the most the custom was partially in existence in the case of only a few women in the Mauryan age.

In our plays there are some references which suggest that there was a system during those days, analogous to the present purdah system the veiling cloth covering the whole face including the head.[2] But there is nothing to indicate that the other evils of the purdah system, such as the seclusion of women, their permanent confinement to the inner apartments, etc., which were the invariable concomitants of the purdah system were present. It appears that women simply covered their faces to avoid the sinful glances of the commoners. Maidens had no veils. They moved freely. The covering of the head was not used by widows. The *Rāmāyaṇa* quotation explained above is similar to the one found in our plays; but as we find another reference to veils (*avaguṇṭhanas*) we are inclined to hold that at the time of our poet women used to cover their faces.[3] Not only ladies of royalty and the gentry, but courtesans also were veiled when they passed in carriages.[4] It may be noted that the purdah system with all its implications as introduced by the Mahomedans was quite unknown to the Indians before the entry of the Mahomedans.

On the whole, it is our considered opinion that women received a fair and honourable treatment in those days.

---

1 Introductory Essay to "*Studies in Ancient Hindu Polity*", p. xliii; *Arthaśāstra*, pp. 114, 147—अनिष्कासिन्यः; अनिष्कासिनीनाम् । 2 *Prat.* p. 36—अपनीतसमवगुण्ठनम् ।; *Svapna.* p. 140—संक्षिप्तां यवनिकां ।; *Cru.* st. 38—प्रकारी-कृतमूर्धजानि । 3 *Prat.* I. 29—निर्दोषदृश्या हि भवन्ति नार्यो गंडे विवाहे व्यसने वने च । *Prat.* p. 36—अपनीतसमवगुण्ठनम् । 4 *Cār* p. 89—गृहीतावगुण्ठना ।

CHAPTER XIV.

URBAN AND RURAL LIFE.

The way the citizens and villagers led their life, the particulars of the places they inhabited, and the surroundings under which they worked and lived indicate fairly the degree of civilization of the period. Our plays mention some of the well-known big cities of ancient India, and give a somewhat fair description of Mathurā, Ujjayinī and Vairantya, which may be taken as typical of the cities of the period. For enlightenment on the rural life, we content ourselves with what can be gleaned from the *Bālacarita* and the *Pañcarātra*, with occasional references from the other plays.

The Vedic Aryans no doubt were partly pastoral, partly agricultural people, and did not know much of city life. "Pur" in the *Ṛgveda* has been interpreted to refer to fortified cities, and according to Dr. Acharya, "the Vedic people were not ignorant of stone forts, walled cities, stone houses and brick edifices".[1] There is also a reference to a hundred walled fort. It appears, therefore, that the Vedic Aryans had emerged out of pastoral life and had begun to lead city life. We come across a full-fledged city in the Indus culture, which we take to be Aryan and subsequent to the period of the *Ṛgveda*.[2] The city of Mohenjo-Daro was systematically laid out in rectangular blocks. Streets were sufficiently wide (13' to 30'), carefully aligned, and the principal streets were orientated to the points of the compass. There was an elaborate drainage system of which any modern town may really be proud. Each of the houses, which were

1 *MR*, Sept., 1934, p. 281. 2 *ABI*, XVIII, pp. 385-395.

built of brick, generally had a well, a bath-room, a courtyard and a stairway suggesting an upper storey. It appears that different sites were reserved for residences, market place, business quarters, places of worship or temples, and for the followers of different occupations such as potters, etc.[1]

In the subsequent periods, however, no progress seems to have been made by the Indians in this line, and the epics do not throw much light on the cities and the city life, the descriptions on the whole verging towards exaggeration.

The Buddhist literature tells us much about the cities and buildings of that period. It appears that there were three kinds of cities—Nagara or the capital, Nigama or a city, and, Janapada or a village. The cities had fortifications and high towers for the sentries to observe the enemy from a distance. Beyond the fortified walls were two ditches, one filled with water and the other with mud. Outside the city walls, were the so-called suburbs where the inferior castes such as the potters, the *Cāṇḍālas*, etc., resided. There was no vacant place left around the house for gardens or similar purposes, but the houses opened directly into the streets. Many houses had superstructures, the highest one having, it seems, seven storeys. Greek writers state that the houses were built of wood and wooden pillars were used, but in view of the antiquity of the art of lapidary in India, as also on account of the absence of any conclusive proof in support, the pillars are taken to be carved out of stones. There were underground drains for carrying sewage, which were so big that not only wolves and jackals but even thieves could enter the city through them after the city walls were closed for the night. Outside the cities there were public parks and gardens which were also utilized for religious discourses. There were also rest-houses or sarais (Avasathagaras) for travellers.[2]

The *Arthaśāstra* devotes two chapters to stating the laying out of a new city. The town was to be circular, rectangular or square in shape. The palace was placed in

1 Cf. Section G of DK area. The information about the Indus civilization is gathered from Sir John Marshall's "*Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization.*"
2 Joshi, *Aravinda*, 1921, pp. 347-350; Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, pp. 63-71, 78.

the northern portion. To the east of the palace were traders and artisans as well as the kitchen, elephant-stables, treasury, and manufactories. To the south were the offices of the different Superintendents and traders in cooked rice, liquor and flesh, and prostitutes, musicians and the Vaiśyas. To the west were the armoury and arsenal, stables of asses and camels, chariots, and artisans in wool, cloth and leather, and the Śūdras. To the north were the tutelary deity, iron-smiths, jewellers and the Brāhmaṇas, as well as shops and hospitals. The centre of the city was reserved for apartments of Gods where temples of various Gods were built. There was a ditch around the city and beyond hundred cubits were constructed places of worship and pilgrimage, groves and buildings. The cremation grounds were either to the north or to the east; those for the people of the highest caste were placed to the south. Further off were the quarters of the heretics, *Cāṇḍālas*, etc. Every group of ten houses was to have one well. There were also underground drains to carry off rain water. Public rest-houses or sarais were maintained for the benefit of travellers.[1]

Now we shall refer to our plays for particulars about urban life.

In the fifth act of the *Bālacarita*, we get a short description of Mathurā, the capital of Kaṁsa. After entry, one came across city guards mounted on elephants and then there were the quarters of washermen. Then after a short distance along the main road, which used to be decorated by flags, banners and floral garlands and scented by aguru and sandal smoke on festive occasions, were to be seen garland makers, florists, perfumers, etc. Armoury was the next important place and then the Court. In the interior of the city was a stadium where wrestling competitions and prize fights were staged. The royalty witnessed the scene from the royal balcony built high up on one side of the arena.

The splendour and affluence of Laṅkā is evinced by what we read about it in the second act of the *Abhiṣeka*. The description of the palace with its mansions, turrets of gold and parks, adorned with coral trees reads like a fairy tale, as also the subsequent description of the Pramada-

1 *Arthaśāstra*, II. 3, 4, pp. 51-57.

Vana where gold and gems are again brought in. It appears that each house had an inner apartment and a hall. There were also public baths and drinking houses and a fleet of ærial cars.[1] The Pramadavana (royal pleasure garden) had numerous big trees wrought in gold and set with blue gems and also had a number of beautiful spotless hillocks. Laṅkā had also a number of artificial lakes containing water-animals, mountains with wonderful rivulets and gold mines, and public and private gardens with trees ever green and full of flowers and fruits. Trikūṭa was one of the royal gardens among the Pramadavanas, having a number of bees, and containing clusters of lotus plants and numerous other trees. Aśokavanikā was another pleasure garden, a special favourite of Her Majesty Queen Mandodarī, reared up with such a tender care that no sprouts were ever plucked; nor were the young trees ever touched even by hands.

More realistic and typical of the average city of the period is the description of Vairantya, the capital of Kuntibhoja, given in the *Avimāraka*.[2] The city had palatial buildings in the market place with snow-white colours on both sides of the roads. The verandahs on the ground floor were used as shops for selling country sugar, honey and other commodities. The upper storeys were the residential quarters where the fashionable city-bred beaux and courtesans vied with each other in showing themselves in their best attire, and they were to be seen walking to and fro in the balconies of their respective quarters with a view to see and to be seen. The courtesans followed their trade in the business quarters of the city, possibly in the centre of the town, but they had to reside outside[3]. The public gaming house was situated at a prominent place in the city with its own gaming laws and regulations, paying some revenue out of the proceeds to the state.[4] There were also public squares in the cities called *nagaracatvaras* where bulls dedicated to deities roamed about freely after being sumptuously fed, and none dared touch them.[5] The city had also a public park

---

1 *Abh*, II. 4. 2 *Avi*, pp. 27-28. 3 *Avi*, p. 44, and III. 8—नगरपणालिन्दे; p. 29—सलक्षणोभा पाण्डुरगणिका विभ्र रति पस्तदो सद्दुं आगच्छामि। Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, p. 55—स्पर्शीवासाकापचारा वेश्याश्च दक्षिणां दिशमधिवसेयुः। 4 *Avi*, p. 45—'द्यूतकरणं विटसभा' 5 *Cār*, p. 10—चरउ वुसहो विअ...रोमन्थमणो...।

where citizens could go with their wives and make merry, but it was strictly guarded and entry restricted when some royal princess visited the place with her retinue.[1] In another connection we read of a tavern-keeper selling liquor, and a public drinking-house in another principal town.[2] There were public rest-houses where travellers could put up for some time. Public baths in Ujjayinī, possibly on the ghats of the river Śiprā, are incidentally referred to.[3] Important cities were fortified on all the sides.[4] Underground drains which have been a speciality of India since ancient times are to be met with also in the period under consideration, the reference being to streets being flooded due to the choking up of the drain.[5]

There were big parks outside the cities where citizens of both sexes went on festive occasions. Well watered green trees and blossoming gardens suggested the vicinity of a city, as these gardens, which were well cared for, presented quite a different aspect from the dried up and leafless trees that one came across during one's way.[6] The Cāṇḍālas had to reside outside the city in settlements resembling the Ghettos of the Middle Ages and the Indian localities in South Africa, and they were subjected to unspeakable ignominies.[7] The courtesans resided outside the city and the cowherds also had their cottages outside.[8]

We are given a beautiful description of the city at night in the *Avimāraka* and the *Cārudatta*.[9] There were beatings of the drum and proclamation to mark the beginning and the close of the night with a view to warn the citizens against moving outside during the period.[10] The *Arthaśāstra* also mentions the sounding of the trumpet; but on special occasions permits were to be granted for exemptions from the curfew order.[11] The exceptions were in the case of midwives, doctors, carriers of dead bodies to the cremation grounds, those going out to extinguish fire, etc. In the period of our plays, however, the prohibition as to moving

---

1 *Avi*, p. 2. 2 *Pratijñā*, pp. 56-57. 3 *Svapna*, p. 102.—'उदअड्डाणाणि' 4 Cf. *Pratijñā*, p. 64—'प्राकार' 5 *Pratijñā*, p. 50—आवट्टिदपणालीपसुदसलिलविसमं रा अमग्गं । ; Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, III. 8, p. 167—पणालीमोक्षो वर्षति । ; also *CHI*, I, p. 476. 6 *Prat*, p. 57 ; *Abh*, p. 6. 7 *Avi*, p. 14 ; *Pañc*, p. 52. 8 *Avi*, p. 29 ; *Bāl*, p. 39 ; *Pañc*, p. 52. 9 *Avi*, pp. 45-46 ; *Cār*, Acts I and III. 10 *Cār*, pp. 65-78. किरपरिघोसणदाए (p. 65) ; नेपथ्ये पटहशब्दः (p. 78). 11 *Arthaśāstra*, II. 36, p. 146—विषण्णाल्किमुभयतो वामतूर्दं ।...सूतिकाचिकित्सकमेतप्रदीपानयन etc.

about during night does not seem to have been strictly followed. There were also night-guards and watchmen to patrol the streets.[1] In spite of these precautions, thieves were not uncommon with their swords, ropes and measuring cords. Thieving was followed as a fine art under instructions from preceptors, and it had its guardian deities like St. Nicholas or Mercury. Thieves knew the art of house-breaking very well, and they were experts in magic such as causing drowsiness to inmates, etc.[2] There were bravados and favourites of the king, who with the help of their servants pursued unwilling courtesans and followed their nefarious practices escaping the attention of the night-guards.[3] The city was completely plunged in darkness during night, save what little light came from the windows of the rows of buildings on the sides of the roads.[4] There were no lamp posts and no arrangements were made for lighting the streets. Those wandering during the night used to take lamps with them.[5] Kauṭilya also advises the carrying of lamps. Nothing is known about street-lights from the *Arthaśāstra*. There were held singing and music conferences during night which continued till a very late hour, and men of the status of Cārudatta felt no hesitation in attending them.[6] Some persons, possibly the cultured among the rich, practised song and music in their own residences ; and ladies in respectable families were educated in these arts.[7]

As regards residential quarters of the general public, our plays do not throw much light on the construction or the interior of the house. It seems that the residences of persons of the upper middle class (of the status of Cārudatta) were built of bricks and were surrounded by gardens[8]. Vātsyāyana recommends the sinking of a well or tank or a lake in the midst of a garden that was attached to every house. Kitchen vegetables, aromatic and medicinal herbs, scented flowers, etc. were to be planted in the garden adjoining the house and generally the mistress of the house managed everything concerning the

---

1 *Avi*, p. 45.—अये रक्षिणः खलेते । 2 *Cār*, Act III. 3 *Cār*, Act I. 4 *Avi*, p. 45—उभयपंक्तिगतानां प्रासादानां गवाक्षान्तर्गतदीपप्रभेव। । ; *Cf.* also *Cār*, p. 66—उपारूढोऽर्धरात्रः । स्थिरतिमिरा राजमार्गाः । 5 *Cār*, pp. 27, 28, 41.—'दीपिका वावत्' 6 *Cār*, pp. 64-66. 7 *Avi*, pp. 43-44. 8 *Cār*, III. 8. and pp. 71, 78.—'वृक्षवाटिका'

garden.[1] There were quadrangular courtyards in the houses; and different apartments, each containing a number of rooms, were built, of which one was reserved for ladies. In the quadrangular courtyards men used to meditate or meet the visitors, and the passage to the inner apartments lay through the courtyards.[2] The inner apartments were quite inaccessible to strangers, and persons of questionable character such as courtesans, were not admitted inside. The sanctity of the inner apartments was thought to suffer even if ornaments worn by courtesans were kept in them.[3] It appears there were separate servants' quarters and the mistress of the household at times had to make a big sound of the door panels to attract the attention of her maid.[4]

The palatial establishment of a courtesan indicating the flourishing condition of different crafts and arts, so elaborately dealt with by the author of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, has been very modestly described by our author. In contrast to the portal made of ivory, doors of gold, gaming table with jewelled chessboard, paintings, music halls, culinary, jewellery, perfumery, botanical and zoological gardens, as well as an aviary with a number of caged and tame birds, showing the splendour of a typical mansion, we meet only the Pandits, goldsmiths, cooks and musicians in the account given in our play.[5] At another place the painter's board and other instruments are referred to as being kept in an apartment of the house.[6]

There is no mention in any of the plays of any furniture such as chairs, couches, mosquito-curtains etc. The *Jātakas* mention these articles, and Vātsyāyana mentions carpets, cushions, etc.[7]

An ideal thorough-bred gentleman of the town was kind to servants, and generous to a fault, spending his wealth for the sake of others, leaving nothing with him, like a dried-up stream in summer that has quenched the thirst of many a traveller. He was ready to appreciate and reward good

---

1 Chakladar, *Social Life*, p. 151; Cf. also, *Arthaśāstra*, II. 4. p. 56—तेषु पुष्पफलवाटषण्डकेदारान्···कुर्युः। 2 *Ari*, pp. 23, 42, 86; *Cār*, pp. 28, 36, 71. 3 Cf. *Cār*, p. 36—अभाइणी अहं अब्भन्तरप्पवेसस्स। also p. 70. बाह्यजनधारितमस्कुरं गृहजनो न द्रक्ष्यति 4 *Cār*, p. 81: कवाटमहं दाव करिस्सं। sort of call-bell! 5 *Cār*, p. 97; *Mṛcch*, Act IV. 6 *Cār*, p. 88. 7 Cf. Joshi, *Aravinda*, 1921, p. 360; Chakladar, *Social Life*, p. 155.

works and deeds of valour. His merits and good deeds created such a fine and forceful impression among even the dare-devils that they were afraid of his virtues; it was considered by them sacrilegious to offend or insult such a person.[1] He was a lover of music and at nightfall used to visit musical concerts where vocal and instrumental music was performed occasionally attended with dances. Always ready to help others, he never boasted of his charity, nor kept any memory of insults or offences done to him. He was so modest as to regard even his own body as belonging to others.[2] Gentlemen in those days kept shampooers to massage their bodies, and it is interesting to note that Vātsyāyana recommends massage every other day.[3] It appears that they also used to have aromatic smoke after bath.[4] From the two examples supplied to us, we may say that a Nāgarika of those days was not very scrupulous with regard to sexual morals, but it cannot be said that moral standards were lax in those days. Both the gentlemen loved courtesans with a desire to matrimony and not merely as a momentary diversion.[5]

The cowherds in the *Pañcarātra* and the *Bālacarita* convey to us some idea of the pastoral life of those days. Ascribing divinity to cows and worshipping them on special occasions has been in vogue in India since long, and was current at the time of these plays. Cows are goddesses to the herdsmen, and the first question of their greeting relates to the well-being of the cows; that of the relatives is asked later on.[6] The cowherds are taken to be pure by nature on account of their life in the *ghoṣa*.[7] It is interesting to note that of the various methods of purification to discard pollution, only two methods, *viz.* by application of dust, and by plunging into water are referred to in the *Bālacarita*, and the application of dust is mentioned as the usual purificatory form for the cowherds.[8] The cowherds make ready for merry-making and dance on the occasion of special festivities such as the king's birthday or the *Indrayajña* or *Dhanurmaha* festivals.

---

1 *Cār*, I. 26; also, p. 33—सत्यं भीतोऽस्मि।···तस्य गुरोरन्यः। 2 *Cār*, pp. 52-53. 3 *Cār*, pp. 51-52; Chakladar, *Social Life*, p. 158. 4 *Cār*, p. 29—सुरभिस्नानधूपानुविद्ध इव गन्धः। 5 Cārudatta and Sajjalaka in the *Cār*. 6 *Bāl*, p. 11—अपि भगवतीभ्यो गोभ्यः कुशलम् etc. 7 *Bāl*, p. 14—घोषवासात् प्रकृत्या शुचिरेव भवान्। 8 *Bāl*, pp. 14-15.

Hallisaka was their special dance on these occasions, wherein youths of both sexes participated. Old herdsmen acted as spectators for these mixed dances in which the youngsters appeared in their best dresses.[1] These cowherds were susceptible to common superstitions, and the shrill crowing of a crow facing the sun on a dry branch of a dry tree was an inauspicious omen to them. They resided in the suburbs and had plenty of milk and its products, fruit, root, etc.[2] Their humble dwellings appeared as quite *samṛddha* to them, and their prayers are for peace and blessings and freedom from harm to the divine cows and to their own families.[3]

---

1 *Pañc*, pp. 48–52; also, *Bāl* pp. 38–42. 2 *Pañc*, p. 48. 3 The word '*Pakkaṇa*' apparently means 'residence of a Cāndāla'; but in the *Bāl*, it signifies 'huts or cottages similar to those of the Cāndālas. In the *Pañc*, however, we think the word '*Pakkaṇa*,' signifies 'residence of a Cāndāla' (contra, Ganapati Sastri, *Pañc*, p. 52, Com.) as the cowherds have come out for celebrating birthday of their king, and it is at the approach of the Kuru army that in their hurry they speak of entering the residences of the Cāndālas.

CHAPTER XV.

COURT LIFE.

The influence of the *Arthaśāstra* would be found to have been exercised more in this branch than anywhere else in the period of our plays. This need not be taken as indicating posteriority of our poet to Kauṭilya, because Bhāsa seems to have studied Bṛhaspati, and as Kauṭilya also has laid Bṛhaspati under contribution, there is nothing surprising in the remarkable similarities with regard to various *Arthaśāstra* doctrines in Bhāsa and Kauṭilya. As regards similarity in the sociological conditions portrayed by Bhāsa and Kauṭilya, the fact is not inconsistent with our view of placing Bhāsa as a senior contemporary of Kauṭilya.

We get descriptions of the palace of a king in the *Avimāraka* and the *Abhiṣeka*.[1] The palace was fortified on all sides by strong and high walls and *kapiśīrṣakas* were placed on the walls at different points.[2] Kauṭilya speaks of thick slabs of stones of the size of the head of a monkey (called *kapiśīrṣakas*) to be placed on the sides of the road on the rampart. Bhāsa also speaks of such roads on the high fortified walls, which were placed to facilitate the rounds of the guards. These walls, in reality long big chambers, were to contain various delusive rooms with secret passages and exits into underground chambers or outside the ditch. There were also many hidden staircases and mechanical devices calculated to pull down the whole structure in no time.[3] Within this fort were the elephant-stables, horse-stables, guest houses, artificial

1 *Avi*, Act III, pp. 46–48; *Abh*, II, 2. 2 *Avi*, p. 46—'कपिशीर्षक'।
3 *Arthaśāstra*, I. 20, p. 40; cf. *Avi*, p. 47—अट्टोलप्रतोलीन्द्रघोषः।

mountains, music halls, summer-house, etc.[1] The palaces of more ambitious kings in those days had gold and jewellery scattered at various places, with floors decorated with mosaic work inlaid with coral and precious stones. Then there was the consultation chamber (*mantraśālā*) where the king met his ministers and advisers to discuss important affairs of the state. The court room (*upasthānagṛha*) where the queen also sat with the king, was near the harem (*antaḥpura*) and was thought as always easy of approach by the ministers.[2] There was also an armoury (*āyudhāgāra*) where, in addition to various defensive and offensive weapons, armours and other war material, arrangements were made for keeping royal prisoners.[3] Then there was a *śāntigṛha* attached to the palace for the performance of propitiatory rites.[4] The theatre also was housed in a separate room in the palace where suitable dramatic pieces were staged on special occasions by actors in the service of the king.[5]

The princess royal, queen, and their retinue resided in a specially guarded part of the palace known as *kanyāpuraprāsāda*.[6] Persons of proved ability and tested character were appointed to posts in the harem to supervise the inmates and guard the harem against the entry of unauthorized persons. *Kāñcukīya*, according to Vātsyāyana, was the designation of a female overseer of the women's apartment. Kauṭilya also speaks of the employment of old women and eunuchs in the harem.[7] In dramatic literature including the works of Bhāsa, however, we come across *Kāñcukīya* or *Kañcuki*, an officer in the harem, who is always a male. Princesses had their own establishment of servants. They kept many tame and caged birds, went to their exclusive pleasure-gardens and artificial lakes, and passed their time occasionally on the terrace. There was much of woodwork in the construction of the harem which had doors with mechanical devices for opening them.[8]

Kingship. Whatever the origin of kingship, whether in the *Mātsyanyāya* or in the social contract, or in divine rights, in Vedic times kingship seems to have

---

1 *Avi*, pp. 47–48. 2 *Avi*, pp. 5, 8. 3 *Pratijñā*, p. 67 also Act II. 4 Cf. *Pratijña*, p. 23. 5 *Prat*, p. 8. 6 *Avi*, pp. 26–27; 47–48; 75–76; etc. 7 Chakladar, *Social Life*, p. 109; *Arthaśāstra*, I. 20, pp. 41–42. 8 *Avi*, pp. 47–काष्ठकर्मविदुलतया; 48–जालयन्त्र।

been often elective. From the references in the Vedic texts, it appears that kings were sometimes really elected by the people. Such a king could be deposed if there was a general dissatisfaction with his rule.[1] In the epic period also, we get traces of the elective system in the consecration of Rāma as Crown Prince when Daśaratha consulted all the subjects as well as the *pariṣad* of princes. In the *Mahābhārata* also we read of the coronation of Devāpi in obedience to the voice of the people as also of Puru after getting the public sanction. The *Jātakas* also speak of the election of Bodhisattva by people. But generally speaking the elective system passed out of vogue in the post-Vedic period and gradually kingship became hereditary, eldest son of the last ruler succeeding him on the throne. Views of the people as also of the ministers were taken into account in making the choice. Succession was, however, always limited to males. Till the time of Mahāpadmananda, the king belonged to the Kṣatriya caste as a rule. At the time of our poet as also of the *Arthaśāstra* the office of a king was hereditary.[2] No reference is found in our plays to the non-monarchical states or republics referred to by Pāṇini or the Buddhists.

The king had a daily round of heavy duties as laid down in the *Arthaśāstra*.[3] He got up at about 3 A. M. and went to bed at about 9 P. M. Both the day and night were each divided into eight equal parts called *nālikās* and various duties were assigned to the king during each *nālikā*.[4] Thus, during the first *nālikā* of the day (*i. e.*, roughly 6 A. M.–7–30 A. M.) the king should attend to defences and accounts; during the second, to affairs of citizens and villagers; during the third, he should bathe, dine and study; during the next two *nālikās* he

---

1 Banerjea, *Pub. Adm*, pp. 64-65; Majumdar, *Corp. Life*, pp. 97-98; Venkateswara, *Indian Cult.*, II, p. 8; also *Rgveda*, X. 124. 8; *Atharvaveda*, III, 3, 4; etc. 2 Cf. *Pratijñā*, Sahasrānika—Śatānika—Udayana; *Avi.*, Duryodhana—Kuntibhoja; etc., cf. also *Arthaśāstra* V. 6, pp. 254-257. 3 *Arthaśāstra* I, 19, pp. 87-88. 4 A note on *nālikā* seems necessary on account of diverse meanings attached to the word. Dr. Woolner (*Thirteen Trivandrum Plays*, II, p. 70 n1) takes *nālikā* (*Avi*, p. 13; *Abh*, p. 28) to be 24 minutes and states that neither four hours (i. e. ten *nālikās* according to him) after day-break nor four hours after midday seem suitable for the king's bath. Dr. Weller makes it eight hours. Dr. Woolner suggests "perhaps after counting upto ten *nālikās* one began again". Dr. Sarup takes *nālikā* to be a vessel for bathing. Now, the *Arthaśāstra* makes one *nālikā* equal to an hour and a half, and prescribes a second bath for the king during the tenth *nālikā* (i. e. roughly 7-30—9 p. m.). In Bhāsa's time it appears that the second bath was taken after the tenth *nālikā*. The word *nālikā* occurs on page 13 of the *Arthaśāstra* where the above meaning does not suit the context.

should receive revenue, see various superintendents, issue writs, consult his council of ministers and receive secret information from his spies; the next part was for his favourite entertainments; during the seventh part of the day, he should inspect elephants, horses, cavalry and infantry; and the last part (4-30 P. M.—6 P. M.) should be utilized in planning military operations in consultation with his commander-in-chief. Night also exacted a fair share of work from the king. After his evening prayers, during the first *nālikā* of night, espionage was again to be attended to; bath, supper and study again formed part of the next *nālikā*. The third part should be spent in the harem, and the next two in sleep. Then he was to contemplate on the sciences and the procedure to be followed during the next day. Administrative measures were considered and spies sent out in the next part (3 A. M.—4-30 A. M.), and benedictions from priests and teachers were received during the last part of the night, as also visits from his physician, cook and astrologer. Then the day was begun by the king going to his court after circumambulating a cow with its calf and a bull. The time-table was not to be adhered to the very letter but was liable to modification according to circumstances. Now, in our plays, we find references to night-baths, which become thoroughly inexplicable and appear ridiculous unless read in conjunction with the *Arthaśāstra*.[1] Again, references are found to the king cousulting his priests and astrologers as also his ministers, envoys and spies. The king's position was not an easy one in those days. His life was constantly threatened and the palaces were always hot-beds of plots and counterplots, and anything was thought possible to happen within their four walls.[2]

The king was generally conscious of his heavy responsibilities.[3] He was merely the bearer of the burden of the doings of his subjects.[4] The kingdom was, as it were, held by the king in trust for his people. The duties of the king as well as secrets of successful kingship are

---

1 *Avi*, pp. 13, 32; *Abh*, p. 28. One scholar accused Bhāsa of breaking the unity of time by referring to a bath at night (*Sāhitya Samgraha*, I. p. 108). Normally bath was taken during the day and apparently this lapse militated against the unity of time. But on the strength of the information supplied by the *Arthaśāstra* we see how close a student our author was of the science of politics and his minute attention to the unity of time. 2 *Prat*, pp. 15, 17.—बहुयुत्तन्तानि राज्जाणि णाम। 3 Cf. *Avi*, p. 13.—अहो महद्भारो राज्यं नाम। 4 Cf. *Prat*, VII. 11.—'सत्तमारवाही

beautifully put in a nutshell in a verse by Bhāsa. All the actions of the king were to be based on *Dharma*; he was defender of the faith; he was himself to weigh the ability of his ministers. He was to conceal his favour and frown, was to act softly or harshly as dictated by circumstances; he was to learn about the doings of his subjects and foreigners as also of the circle of the kings from his spies; he was to protect his own self by efforts, yet again he was not to spare himself in war.[1] Preservation of peace and security in the realm were the prime concerns of the king. State affairs, therefore, were not to be neglected even for a moment.[2]

Performance of sacrifices and the good will of the Brāhmaṇas were things to rejoice in. Sacrifice was considered the *magnum opus*, as it were, of the king. Renown based on sacrifices never perished and kings were remembered through the sacrifices they performed.[3] The king's portion was usually a sixth of the produce.[4] Kings were to amass big fortunes but they were enjoined to spend all their belongings in good works and leave only the bow as patrimony to their sons.[5] *Yajña*, *satya*, *dāna* and *parākrama* seem to be the virtues a king was enjoined to possess.[6] Sovereignty was held to be won by sheer valour and strength of arms, not by begging. Heroism, however, required to be tempered by time and space.[7]

In contrast to the modern science of warfare current in the west, kings who were commanders-in-chief of their forces generally participated personally in wars. War was as a pleasure to them. Enemy was taken to be a guest who wanted war, and in the true Indian fashion the guest was royally treated,[8] Wounds received in war were looked upon as ornaments.[9] War was not to be avoided through fear, as in any event, heroes were to gain. If they succeeded they enjoyed the earth and the spoils of war; if dead, they enjoyed heaven.[10] Flight from war was always condemned.

---

1 *Avi*, I. 12. Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, I. 8, p. 12.—(तस्मात्स्वधर्मे भूतानां राजा न प्रमिचारमेत् ।); I. 10, pp. 16-18; I. 4, p. 9 (तीक्ष्णदण्डो हि भूतानामुद्वेजनीयः, मृदुदण्डः परिभूयते ।); I. 11-14, pp. 18-25; XII, 3-5, pp. 386-394; etc. 2 *Prat*, p. 92.—राज्यं नाम मुहूर्तमपि नोपेक्षणीयम् । 3 *Pañc*, I. 25. 4 *Avi*, p. 62. षड्भागग्रहणममाकं धर्मः । 5 *Pañc*, I. 24. 6 Cf. *Avi*, I. 2; VI. 19. 7 *Dv*, st. 24; p. 18. देशकालबलापेक्षि खलु शौर्यं नवानुगामिनाम् । 8 *Pañc*, II. 13....रणातिथिः लोपचिये ।; *Abh*, IV. 22. रणातिथिः । 9 *Cru*, st. 51. 10 *Pañc*, II. 5 d; *Abh* p. 38 n4.

It was thought advisable for kings to do things after consulting their ministers.[1] *Mantraśālā* was the consultation chamber and different personages occupied different seats according to their ranks.[2] Whenever occasion arose, the opinion of the whole assembly was taken; but at times, kings like Duryodhana overrode the decision of the assembly and had their own way. The very fact that despots like Duryodhana had to call such assemblies to confer on important matters of state amply signifies the high regard for the *Arthaśāstra*. Duryodhana concurred with the verdict of the assembly in the choice of the commander-in-chief, but in his treatment of Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa who came as the messenger of the Pāṇḍavas, he followed his personal whim.[3]

It seems that respectable citizens generally came to sympathize with the king, condole with him or to congratulate him on the happening of important and momentous events.[4] There does not seem to be a large retinue with the kings of Bhāsa. The usual female door-keeper, the chamberlain, an attendant and the jester—companion formed the maximum retinue of the king. Twice we come across female torch-bearers.[5] There is absolutely no mention of the female bodyguards or Greek women that characterized the retinue of a king in the *Arthaśāstra* as well as in Kālidāsa.[6] Important matters of state could be reported to the king though he be in company of the queen. On such occasions the queen generally rose to go.[7]

Influence of the *Arthaśāstra* even on the personal lives of kings would be evident from the number of political marriages contracted during the period. The marriage of Padmāvatī with Vatsarāja forms part of the *Svapnavāsavadatta*. All the principal ruling families of the period were related to each other by matrimonial alliances. King Bimbisāra had married Kośala and Vaiśālī princesses, and Ajātaśatru had married a Kośala princess. Udayana's mother was from Videha and he

1 Cf. *Abh*, p. 7. 2 *Dv*, p. 6; cf. *Nāṭyaśāstra* XIII. 208-209. 3 Cf. *Dv*, p. 3—सर्वपार्थिवैः सह···I; p. 6—उच्यताम्···अस्य कः सेनापतिर्भवितुमर्हति।···वयमप्येतदभिलषामः।; p. 8—किं वक्तव्यं···न मे रोचते।; p. 14—नन्वहमाज्ञप्ता···।; p. 22—वध्यतामयं केशवः। 4 *Avi*, p. 18. 5 *Abh*, III. 2; *Bāl*, II. 2. 6 Cf. Winternitz, *Problems*, p. 121; Ray Chaudhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind*, 2nd Ed. p. 172; *Arthaśāstra*, I. 21. p. 42—स्त्रीगणैर्वेत्रिभिः 7 *Pratijñā*, p. 30.

married princesses from Avanti and Magadha. Prasenajit married a Śākya princess.

About the dress of kings, there is not much to rely on. Like the commoners the king also wore two garments, but they were coloured and made of silk. He was armoured and had chowries and the royal umbrella over his head. Probably he wore a crown on his head. He put on ornaments in his hand.[1]

The coronation ceremony originally demanded the co-operation of all classes in the state by their representatives, and did not confer kingship in perpetuity. Hereditary kingship was incompatible with the sanction implied in the coronation oath.[2] Elaborate were the preparations that were made at the coronation of a new king in which citizens also took part. The state umbrella, the emblem of sovereignty, and the chowrie were kept ready as also the military drum and the throne. Golden jars filled with consecrated waters, flowers and *darbhas* were also placed there to be poured on the head of the crown-prince. All the ministers, both spiritual and temporal, graced the occasion by their presence and a throng of citizens also assembled to witness the ceremony. The ceremony was performed by the spiritual head of the royal family who occupied the altar. The state chariot was used for the triumphant procession and state entry. The beating of the drum announced the beginning of the ceremony. The king placed the crown-prince on his lap and in the presence of all the subjects, ministers and the family priest, offered him the kingdom. Younger brothers of the crown-prince held the golden jar full of consecrated waters and the king himself took the royal umbrella. Then after the pompous religious functions a dramatic entertainment in the palace-theatre marked the close of the coronation ceremony.[3] The crown-prince was probably dressed differently for the coronation.[4] Almost the same preparations with slight modifications are made for the coronation of princes in India even today. The advent of a new king was always looked upon with great anxiety and suspicion by the subjects.[5]

---

1 *Dv*, st. 3, 10; *Pratijñā*, II. 5; *Abh*, II. 9. 2 Cf. Venkateswara, *Ind. Cult.* II, p. 13. 3 *Prat*, pp. 6–8, 15–20. 4 *Prat*, p. 17. सो एव्व भट्टिदारअस्स वेसो। 5 *Prat*, I. 14—नवमुपतिष्ठिमते नास्ति राज्ञः प्रजानाम् has been mentioned as one of the advantages of the non-completion of his coronation by Rāma.

Instances were not rare of kings disappearing from their palaces due to voluntary exile or forcible ejectment, and no one gained admission to the palace. King Kuntibhoja, when told of the closing of the palace gates against entrants in the Sauvīra country, states that the possible causes for such a state of affairs were that either the king was lustful, or was diseased, or was imprisoned by his ministers, or was testing in disguise the fidelity of those near him, or was making propitiatory rites on being cursed. These more or less correspond with those given by Kauṭilya.[1] In the absence of the Sauvīra king his ministers efficiently carried on the administration refusing admission to the palace.

Kingship in ancient India was not despotism but limited monarchy working on constitutional principles though there were no legislative bodies of elected representatives as at present. The fact that the king was to follow the rules of the *Śāstras* (*Dharmaśāstra* and *Nitiśāstra*) exercised an effective check on the king's autocracy. Other checks on the authority of the king were the ministers and the Brāhmaṇas whose advice he was bound to follow for his safety. His minister and priest were enjoined to warn him by the beating of the drum and similar devices if he was found to neglect his duties, or was addicted to vices such as drinking, gambling, pursuit of women, or was doing any prohibited acts. There was also the moral check of old persons experienced in different sciences which prevented the king from becoming an autocrat.[2]

Ministers occupied a high position in those days. Their lot, however, was neither happy nor enviable, for if their policy succeeded popular opinion credited the king with success; while in case of failure, though it be through the fault of the king, he was exonerated and the ministers were held liable to public criticism.[3] They wielded a considerable influence even in the private life of the king and were consulted in such personal matters as the selection of suitable bride-grooms for the princesses. Ministers were selected from persons well read in political

---

1 *Avi*, I. 11; *Arthaśāstra*, V. 6. 2 Cf. Banerjea, *Pub. Adm.*, pp. 50-51; Venkateswara, *Ind. Cult*, II, p. 74; *Arthaśāstra*, I. 7, p. 13 —ज्ञापनालिङ्गनोदेन एवंप्रमाणमन्तमिक्षुरेवुः। 3 *Avi*, I. 5.

science and devoted to the king. They took part also in war and did not care for their lives while serving their master's cause.[1] Yaugandharāyaṇa says that his resultant position as a prisoner in working for the release of his master may well serve as an eye-opener to many a prospective aspirant for ministership. To the brave and those preferring to live in public memory Yaugandharāyaṇa's plight would confirm them in their ambition for ministership; while the less capable would leave off the ambition.[2] Foreign policy also fell under the control of the ministers.

Practical foresight as also the observance of the dictum of Kauṭilya that "one shall make an alliance with a king who is stronger than one's neighbouring enemy", prompted the ministers of Udayana Vatsarāja to enter into friendly relationship with the Magadha king to ensure his help against the rebel Āruṇi who had invaded the Vatsa kingdom.[3] With that end in view, Yaugandharāyaṇa brought about the marriage of Vatsarāja with a Magadha princess after spreading out the false report of the burning of himself and Vāsavadattā in a fire at Lāvāṇaka. He gave out the true story only after the marriage he had planned was effected, and with the help of the Magadha forces, his master king Udayana Vatsarāja had utterly routed and killed Āruṇi. The influence of the *Arthaśāstra* is in evidence in the preliminaries gone into before attacking Āruṇi, such as causing division in the enemy camp, gaining confidence and devotion of one's own subjects, arranging for the protection of the rear when advance was to be made and placing the army in the country occupied by the enemy.[4]

In Bhāsa, we do not find particulars as to the duties and the number of the ministers or their assembly. Only the prime minister, the commander-in-chief, the Purohita and the royal astrologer are mentioned. Perhaps this number was quite sufficient for carrying on administration. Different writers on politics prescribe different number of ministers constituting the Cabinet. Thus, the Mānavas prefer their number to be twelve, Bārhaspatyas sixteen, Auśanas twenty, Śukra ten, and Kauṭilya, (without

1 Cf. Yaugandharāyaṇa in the *Pratijñā*. 2 *Pratijñā*, IV. 8. 3 *Arthaśāstra*, VII. 2, p. 207.—बहुलसामन्तः सद्विशिष्टबलमाश्रयेत्। 4 *Svapna*, V. 12.

specifying any number) states that they may be taken according to the importance of the work, only three or four being sufficient according to him.[1] The Purohita was adviser to the king in matters religious and secular, and he even went to war, encouraging soldiers and telling them stories about the supernatural powers of the king.[2] Ministers were always to be businesslike and looked at matters from the utilitarian point of view, disregarding private considerations in the discharge of their duties.[3] Ministers were chosen for their efficiency; but in course of time, ministership also became hereditary as may be seen from the *Kathāsaritsāgara* or the Gupta inscriptions.[4]

Foreign relations necessitated the sending of ambassadors or messengers to different courts on various missions. It was a universally accepted and strictly followed rule that ambassadors or envoys were never to be killed. Even tyrants and despots held the person of the ambassador as sacrosanct. The slayer of an envoy and his ministers were, according to the *Mahābhārata*, destined to the depths of hell. An envoy was not to be executed even if he manifestly exceeded his instructions. He could be punished in other ways short of slaying.[5] Thus, *e. g.*, Keśava in the *Dūtavākya* is ordered to be tied down, and Hanuman's tail in the *Abhiṣeka* is ordered to be set fire to.[6] Envoys are said to be the mouthpieces of kings, and they are to express *verbatim* the message of their master, even at the cost of their own lives.[7]

The secret service department was efficiently managed. Kauṭilya mentions different kinds of spies under various disguises to be selected according to the nature of the work. They were employed to get secret information about the king's own subjects as well as from

---

1 *Arthaśāstra*, I. 15, p. 29. 2 *Arthaśāstra*, X, 3, pp. 367-368; Dikshitar, *Hindu Adm. Inst.*, p. 115. 3 *Avi*, p. 18.–सहो कार्यमेवापेक्षते बुद्धिरमात्यानां, न स्नेहम्। 4 Cf. Venkateswara, *Ind. Cult.*, II. p. 108; Naravāhanadatta, the son of Udayana had for his ministers the sons of his father's ministers. 5 *Indian Cult.*, II, pp. 69-70 cf. *Mahābhārata*, XII. 85. 26–दूतस्य हन्ता निरयमाविशेत् सचिवैः सह। also *Gautama*, X. 18; *Rāmāyaṇa*, IV. 52. 2, 15; VI. 25. 21; *Mahābhārata*, XII. 100. 27ff; *Manusmṛti*, VII. 91, 93; etc.; *Abh*, p. 41.–सर्वापराधेष्वबध्याः खलु दूताः।; p. 43. दूतवधः खलु वर्जनीयः। 6 *De*, p. 22–दूतसमुदाचारमतिक्रान्तः केशवो बध्यताम्।; *Abh*. p. 43 लाङ्गूलमादीप्य विसृज्यतामयं वानरः। 7 Cf. Ghatotkaca in *Dyh* (pp. 66-67) and Hanuman in *Abh* (pp. 41-42); also *Arthaśāstra* I. 16, p. 30. शासनं च यथोक्तं ब्रूयात् प्राणाबाधेऽपि सति।

foreign countries.[1] If ambassadors or envoys were the mouthpieces of kings, spies were called the 'eyes' of kings as it was through spies that kings obtained reports on inland and foreign affairs. A king is said to be thousand-eyed on account of the large number of his secret agents.[2] Getting secret information and reporting it were not the only functions of spies. Thus, spies under the guise of cultivators or merchants were sent to detect crimes in connection with royal wealth; ascetic spies through their knowledge of palmistry were to foretell future events concerning a variety of affairs, which their assistants were to carry into action; wandering spies of both sexes who were of different kinds such as fiery (*tikṣṇa*), poisoner (*rasada*) etc., were to espy the movements of the king's officials, spread different rumours, sow seeds of discontent and disharmony in the foreign countries, poison or murder important personages in the enemies' camp, win over the malcontents from the other side, cause disputes among different enemies, etc. Spies went under various guises such as madmen, mendicants, Brāhmaṇas, shopkeepers, etc., in the foreign country, and tried to achieve their objects by bribing and winning over the servants of the enemies or keeping their own persons under the service of the enemy.[3] Their conferences were held in lonely places and Kauṭilya has mentioned five causes of the leakage of the secret conferences, *viz.*, carelessness, intoxication, talking in sleep, love, and evil habits, against which he warns the consultants to safeguard.[4] It was through espionage that Pradyota Mahāsena of Avanti was able to capture Vatsarāja by hiding a number of soldiers inside a mechanical elephant. Yaugandharâyaṇa, prime minister of Vatsarāja, had come to know of the plot of Pradyota and was preparing to send a messenger to warn his master against the trap, but it was too late, as before the messenger could be dispatched Vatsarāja had been caught in the trap and carried a prisoner. Undaunted, Yaugandharāyaṇa made for the capital of Pradyota in the guise of a madman and with the help of his associates paid Pradyota in the same coin, and proved more than a

---

1 Cf. *Avi.* I. 12. परचरनयनैर्मण्डलं प्रेक्षितव्यम्। 2 Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, I. 16, p. 30. दूतमुखा वै राजानः; also *Avi.* I. 12–परचरनयनैः; p. 99–सहस्रनेत्रः। 3 *Arthaśāstra* I. 11, 12; VI. 6; XII. 1; etc. Cf. the plans of Yaugandharāyaṇa as detailed in the *Pratijñā*. 4 *Arthaśāstra*, I. 15, p. 26–प्रमादमदसुप्तपक्षापक्षामादिरसोकः।

match for his rival prime minister by succeeding not only in the release of his master but also in his master's escape with his sweetheart, the daughter of Pradyota.[1] In the *Avimāraka* also, king Duryodhana comes to know of the state of affairs in the Sauvīra kingdom through his spies and makes unsuccessful attempts to find out Avimāraka which, however, do not reflect unfavourably on Kuntibhoja's secret service, as Avimāraka was invisible through the help of the magic ring given to him by a Vidyādhara.[2]

About the machinery of administration, its numerous departments, their superintendents, their duties, the judiciary etc., as also about taxation and various heads of revenue so elaborately dealt with by Kauṭilya, no details are found in our plays. Land revenue, customs, mines, salt and forestry were the chief sources of revenue according to Kauṭilya. The king also resorted to some Macchiavellian devices for augmenting his treasury. As regards interstate relations also, not much light is thrown on the problem.[3]

---

1 Cf. *Pratijñā*. 2 *Avi*, VI. 10, 14 : pp. 105-106. 3 Yaugandharāyaṇa's seeking of an alliance with the powerful Magadha king against Āruṇi in pursuance of the policy laid down in the *Arthaśāstra* (VII. 2, p. 267) has already been referred to.

CHAPTER XVI.

MILITARY ORGANIZATION.

The *Arthaśāstra* mentions six kinds of army, *viz.* hereditary troops (*maula*), mercenary or hired troops (*bhṛtaka*), corporation of troops (*śreṇī*), troops belonging to a friend (*mitrabala*), as also to an enemy (*amitrabala*), and wild tribes (*aṭavibala*), each preceding type being better than the one subsequently mentioned in the order of enumeration. The first three kinds belong to the state of the king and hence are naturally preferable to the last three, who come from outside the state. A friend's army is better than an enemy's and the latter is to be preferred to the wild tribes as it is under the control of an Aryan commandant.[1] Each one of these types again consisted of four parts, elephants, chariots, cavalry and infantry. These were, as it were, the four limbs (*caturaṅga*) of the army.

The *Ṛgveda* refers to the elephant as "fighting"; and Prof. Visvanatha holds that elephants were used in the battlefield, though not so frequently.[2] Despite the view of Dr. Das that they were not used in wars, we feel inclined to believe that the elephant constituted a factor of the military organization of the Vedic Aryans.[3] The elephant was the most important part of the army in the warfare of ancient India, as it could resist the onrush of a number of cavalry and infantry, and could kill a large section of the enemy's camp. At the time when these plays were written, as also of the epics and the *Arthaśāstra*, the elephant was considered the most valuable asset of the army.

1 *Arthaśāstra*, IX. 2, pp. 342-345. 2 *Racial Synthesis*, p. 44. 3 *Rgvedic Culture*, p. 342.

Foreign invaders felt a sort of terror for the Indian army on account of its elephants. Alexander the Great alone among the foreigners through his skill tried to remove the fear his army entertained for elephants by instructing his light infantry to kill the drivers of the elephants; the legs of the helpless elephants were then hacked with long axes and their trunks cut off with choppers or curved swords.[1] Once overtaken by terror, the elephants turned back on their own side and trampled their own men under their feet. Thus in their encounter with the Greeks, not only did the Indians not receive any help from their elephants in checking the enemy, but the elephants destroyed not a little the army of their own masters which fled in confusion, being scared. Yet the unit of elephants held its own and did not lose in importance, for it served the army in a number of ways. They were used in war to pull the chariots of the enemy. The advent of gunpowder, cannon and shells on the battle-field, however, dealt a serious blow to elephants in war, who were horrified at the sound of guns and wrought havoc among their own men. They thus gradually fell into disfavour and their place was taken by cannons, shells and powder.

Besides the four constituent parts named above, the army consisted of officers, camp followers, spies, ensigns and medical attendants. The surgeons had with them various instruments, machines, ointments and bandages, and they were accompanied by nurses with prepared food and beverage, who uttered encouraging words to fighting men.[2] The institution of nurses was first employed on the battle-field in Europe in the Crimean war after the efforts of Florence Nightingale, and this unit received international recognition. The existence of this institution in ancient India testifies not only to the state of civilization in those days and to the humane aspect of the battle-field, but also to the education of women and their mixing up in the public.

Padika was the designation of a commandant having ten soldiers under him; *senāpati* had under his control ten *padikas*; and the commandant of ten *senāpatis*

---

1 Cf. Vaidya, *Epic India*, p. 230. 2 *Arthaśāstra*, X. 3, p. 369. चिकित्सकाः शस्त्रवन्त्रागदक्षेदवस्त्रहस्ताः स्त्रियश्चान्नपानरक्षिण्यः पुरुषाणामुद्धर्षणीयाः पृष्ठतस्तिष्ठेयुः ।

was called a *nāyaka*.[1] The whole army department was under a *senādhyakṣa* or war minister.

Elephants, as already stated, constituted the principal factor of the army in ancient India. They bore the brunt of battle and accounted for a great loss of infantry. The elephant is called the armoury, as it were, of kings.[2] The special preparations of elephants for war consisted in their armour and the clubs, arrow-bags and machines that they carried. These were called the war ornaments of the elephant.[3] The trunk was the most vulnerable part of the elephant and hence it was thoroughly armoured. A rider and one or two warriors occupied the seat on the elephant. Prof. Venkatesvara, however, states that the war elephant, carried three fighting men besides the driver, two of whom shot from the sides and one from behind.[4] A deep blue elephant was reputed to bring sovereignty to its owner king. A special officer known as *hastyadhyakṣa* was in charge of the department, looking after elephant forests, capturing, taming and training of elephants, their rationing, and preparing them for war, etc. He also supervised elephant doctors, trainers and grooms. Large and spacious stables were built for keeping elephants. There were separate apartments for female elephants. Various rules are given as to the capture and training of elephants as also about their rations and daily time-table.[5] The elephant, especially a rogue one, was to be tamed by soft and winning treatment.[6] The exercise, training, rations, etc., of elephants depended on particular seasons. A suitable time is mentioned for capturing elephants, and various methods of charming and capturing elephants are said to have been stated in the *Hastiśikṣā*. King Udayana of Kauśāmbī was an adept in the art of winning over elephants through the melody of his celebrated lute, Ghoṣavatī. Pradyota Mahāsena used an artificial elephant in accordance with the advice of the *Arthaśāstra* to deceive and capture this enemy of his, who was too fond of elephants.[7] Waving of lights (*nirājanavidhi*) was performed to the elephant during the period of Cāturmāsya and on certain specified occasions.

1 *Arthaśāstra*, X. 6, p. 377. 2 *Ūru*, st. 8.—नृपायुधागारमिव। 3 *Arthaśāstra*, II. 32, p. 136. 4 *Ind. Cult*, II, p. 91. 5 *Arthaśāstra*, II. 31, 32, pp. 135–139. 6 Cf. *Pañc*, I. 40.—गज इव बहुदोषो मार्दवेनैव वाह्यः। 7 Cf. *Pratijñā*, Act I. II. 12; also *Arthaśāstra*, XIII. 2, p. 399—हस्तिकामं वा नागवनपालहस्तिना लक्षणेन प्रलोभयेयुः। प्रतिपन्नं गहनमेकायनं वाऽतिनीय घातयेयुः, यदृच्छा वाऽभिहरेयुः।

The *Ṛgveda* (VII. 75. 6) speaks of chariots drawn by horses. In the Mauryan period, the superintendent of chariots attended to the construction of war chariots as well as festal chariots, travelling chariots, chariots for gods, and for training, etc. The superintendent was also to examine the efficiency of the troops in shooting arrows, in hurling clubs and cudgels, in wearing armour, in controlling chariots, horses, and so on.[1] Each charioteer had his particular driver well versed in the art of driving and turning chariots in various ways according to necessity.[2] Generally, charioteers fought with charioteers and their principal weapons were bows and arrows, a large number of the latter being kept in the chariot. Sometimes, cart-loads of arrows were carried in separate cars by the side of the chariots. They also used *śakti* and *cakra*. Both charioteer and driver were armoured, the former wearing leather-gloves for protecting his fingers.[3] Chariots in the *Mahābhārata* age had ordinarily two wheels and were drawn by four horses. Each chariot had a distinct banner containing some special mark to proclaim the identity of its master from afar. Garlands of flowers hung from the flag-posts of the chariots.[4]

For cavalry or horsemen, the best breed of horses was given. Horses were known as the means of securing a kingdom.[5] Those coming from Kāmboja, Sindhu, Araṭṭa, and forest countries were known as the best horses. The superintendent of horses was to register horses according as they were best, medium or ordinary, and to train them either for war or riding according to their capability. There was a number of movements in which war horses were trained. There were specially prepared horse-stables under the supervision of *aśvādhyakṣa* who also looked to their rations, ornaments, medical treatment, exercise and training.[6] Horses were also armoured.[7] Horses were washed, bedaubed with sandal powder and garlanded twice a day. Lights were waved (*nīrājanavidhi*) invoking blessings on the horses on the ninth day of the month of Aśvina and at the commencement and close of a journey.[8]

1 *Arthaśāstra*, II, 30, 33, pp. 132-135, 139-140. 2 Cf. Virāṭa, Uttara and Abhimanyu in the *Paṅc*. 3 Cf. *Do*, st. 8; *Karṇa*, p. 72. 4 Cf. *Ūru*, st. 9—ग्रलंचक्रुश्चमूपतिः etc. 5 *Karṇa*, st. 19—साधनं राज्यलक्ष्म्याः। 6 *Arthaśāstra*, II, 30, pp. 132-135; *Karṇa*, st. 13, 19—श्रीमत्सु कान्दोलकुलेषु जाताः। 7 *Paṅc*, II. 1—तुरगपतयो वर्मरुचिताः। 8 *Arthaśāstra*, II. 30, p. 135; Cf. *Pratijñā*, I. 12.

Infantry or footmen were intended for hand-to-hand fight.

The relative usefulness of these different sections depended upon the seasons, the site and the nature of the operations in which the army was engaged, and particular units were to be chosen having regard to all these factors.

A striking particular about the army was that footmen, horses, chariots and elephants had to undergo daily training excepting the rainy season and a few days, and the king was to watch their drill and parade every morning.[1] Thus, every department of the army was quite efficient and ready, and all footmen formed the standing army. There was no reserve force in those days.

Kauṭilya gives detailed information about encamping.[2] He states that on a site best suited, was to be constructed a camp of suitable shape having four gates, six roads and nine divisions. Around the site were to be ditches, parapets, walls, and watch-towers at suitable points for defence. The camp was to contain quarters for the king and his harem, priest, prime minister, place for worship, different departments of the state, stores, kitchen, armoury and arsenal, quarters of hereditary troops and other troops, chariots, horse and elephant stables, spies and sentinels, and traders and prostitutes. The king's quarters were specially protected by raising four different mounds around them. Disputes, drinking, gathering and gambling were strictly prohibited. Entry to the camp was restricted to passport holders. The march of the army was regulated after obtaining full particulars about the supply of water, firewood, grain and foodstuffs. Orders were to be conveyed to soldiers by secret signals, by different sounds of drums and trumpets. Each member of the army was carefully scrutinized a number of times in order to find out newcomers and deserters. The inspection was conducted by asking each head of the sub-division about the soldiers under his command. Such inquiry was facilitated by the army register specially prepared for each war, containing the name of every soldier and some descriptive particulars about the identity of each individual. Spies from the enemy, using disguises, were detected in such an examination of the army.[3]

1 *Arthaśāstra*, V. 3, p. 249. 2 *Arthaśāstra*, X. 1, 2, pp. 363-366. 3 Cf. *Abh*, pp. 54-56.

The king specified the place and the time of battle, and addressed the army stating that he was equally a paid servant like them. He performed religious rites and gave everything to Brāhmaṇas. Before the actual fight, the king's minister and priest encouraged the army by saying that soldiers went beyond the goal attained by performers of sacrifices or penances; and no vessel filled with consecrated water and covered with *darbha* grass would ever come to him who does not fight in return for the subsistence received from his master, and he was destined to fall into hell. Astrologers told about the divine powers of the king and foretold his victory. Bards described heaven as the goal for the brave and hell for the timid.[1]

Death on the battle-field without showing one's back to the enemy was very highly thought of.[2] Wives of such heroes were advised not to mourn, as their LORDS obtained heaven and immortal fame.[3] An unarmed person was never to be struck nor also a foe prostrate in battle.[4] Generally, the rules of righteous warfare were followed throughout. Foot soldiers fought with foot soldiers and charioteers with the charioteers. Those using mace or bow and arrows fought with those using the same missiles. The laws of war were, as stated by Dr. Banerjea, "humane and honourable".[5] The *Mahābhārata* and the *Dharmaśāstras* lay down various circumstances under which an enemy was not to be killed or even struck with weapons. The contending parties usually inflicted no harm on non-combatants, and the invading soldiers never destroyed the crops nor devastated the enemy's country. With this end in view, battle-fields were selected in remote and uninhabited parts of the country. Kauṭilya, however, recommends the destruction of the crops, stores, granaries and trade if the people be hostile.[6]

During the course of war, spies used to send occasional reports from the actual battle-field to the king. Thus we are told about the course of events leading to the victory of Uttara through the agents of the secret service.

---

1 Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, X. 3, pp. 367-368; Cf. *Pratijñā*, IV. 3. 2 Cf. *Uru*, pp. 107, 108, 109; अपराङ्मुखो वृधि हतः। (p. 107); न पराङ्मुखो वृधि हतः। (p. 108); तुल्येनाभिमुखं रणे हतः। (p. 109). 3 *Uru*, st. 51, 52—न हि स्वन्तेनविधानां स्त्रियः। 4 *Pañc*, II. 52—न्यस्तशस्त्रं हि को हन्यात्; also *Uru*, st. 22. 5 *Pub. Adm.*, p. 238. 6 Cf. Megasthenes, Fragment I; *Arthaśāstra*, XIII. 4, p. 404—विषमलस्य वृष्टि सस्यं वा हन्याद्वीवधमारौ च।

Rāvaṇa also gets news about war immediately his servant goes out to obtain it.[1]

After war, the principal duty of the commander-in-chief was to reward the brave according to their merits. The names of the warriors and deeds of their valour were recorded in the annals of the state.[2] The head of the defeated army, however, took it as his main concern to enquire as to the safety and whereabouts of the officers under him.[3]

The *Ṛgveda* mentions bow and arrow, axes, javelins and swords as the instruments used in warfare. References are also found to mailed warriors wearing golden and iron helmets, leather-guards for arms, breast-plates, coats of mail, armours and shields.[4] Various weapons and implements of war are mentioned by our poet attesting to the progress of the science of warfare in those days. The bow and arrows were the principal weapons of all the four divisions of the army—the infantry, cavalry, chariots and elephants. Bow and arrows were preferred to discs (*cakras*) or lances, as they could be effectively used from a distance and for a number of times; whereas discs or lances can be used only once and not often like boomerangs. Nor again can a large number of discs or lances be carried on the person of a warrior, whereas an individual can keep and use a number of arrows. A charioteer could store a large supply and also could change the venue of his attack quickly and thus could use the bow and arrows to a greater advantage. On the arrows was inscribed the name of the warrior to whose quiver they belonged.[5]

Many of the weapons mentioned by Bhāsa are found enumerated in the *Arthaśāstra*.[6] Kauṭilya classifies weapons and instruments under offensive and defensive, and the former are again sub-divided into movable

---

1 *Pañc*, p. 67, II. 24; *Abh*, pp. 35–38. 2 *Pañc*, p. 70; II. 26; p. 91; cf. *Arthaśāstra*, X. 3, p. 368—सङ्ग्रामाणां शूराणां स्वर्गमार्गे मोक्षाणां जातिकर्मवृत्तसत्वं च घोषानां कर्मवेषु: । 3 *Pañc*, III. 2, 3, 4. 4 *Ṛgveda*, VI. 27, 6; VI. 57. 1 and 2; VI. 75. 14; Das, *Ṛgvedic Cult*, pp. 219–220, 336; Visvanatha, *Social Synthesis* p. 43. 5 *Pañc*, II. 50; III. 17, 18; *Abh*, p. 11—शरे नामाक्षराणि वाचयित्वा । 6 Bhāsa has mentioned शक्ति, प्रास, दाटक, भिन्दिपाल, शूल, मुसल, मुद्गर, वराहकर्ण, कणय, कर्पण, शङ्कु, चासिक, गदा, नाराच, तोमर, चाप, शर, कुन्त, कवच, कृष्टि, कुल्हि, सायक, असि, करवाल, धनुः (*Ūru*, sl. 2, 8. 19, p. 30; *Bāl*, V. 12; *Abh*, II. 10, VI. 3, 4; *Pratijñā*, pp. 26, 28, 113; etc).

machines (*calayantra*) and immovable machines (*sthitayantra*). Among the defensive weapons are mentioned shields, bucklers and the armour. Bhāsa also refers to armour and shield at some places.[1] Nine different kinds of immovable machines have been mentioned by Kauṭilya which were capable of showering stones or arrows, of kindling or extinguishing fire, of obstructing the passage of the enemies, or of killing them from different points by their weight. Bhāsa, it appears, has not mentioned any of these immovable machines. Out of the movable machines, we get references to *musala*, *mudgara*, *gadā*, *triśūla*, and *cakra*. *Musala* was a pointed rod like *śūla* made of *khadira* wood. *Mudgara* was a short, round, heavy wooden staff with a handle. *Gadā* was a long and heavy rod known as a mace. *Triśūla* was a trident having pointed ends. *Cakra* was a disc which went revolving after delivery. There were machines to shower discs over the enemy. Other movable machines include *pañcālika* (wooden board with long pointed nails), *devadaṇḍa* (pole with nails), *sūkarikā* (leather bag for defence against attack of stones), *hastivāraka* (big pointed rod with two or three points to drive away elephants), *audghāṭima* (to pull down towers), spade, etc. All the weapons enumerated by Kauṭilya are mentioned by Bhāsa. *Śakti* was a metallic weapon, six cubits long with a handle of the shape of a cow's nipple. *Prāsa* had two handles and was two feet in length; *trāsika* (*trāsi* in Bhāsa) was a metallic rod similar to *prāsa*. *Kunta* was a wooden rod five, six or seven feet long; *kunta* with a heavy top was called *bhiṇḍivāla*. The rod known as *hāṭaka* had three or four pointed edges, while *śūla* was a pointed rod without any fixed length. *Tomara* was four to five cubits in length and had an arrow-like edge. *Varāhakarṇa*, as the name signifies, had its edges shaped like the ear of a boar. *Kaṇaya* was a metallic rod with a handle at the middle and triangular ends at both sides. *Karpaṇa* was a missile to be thrown by hand. *Veṇu*, *śara*, *śalākā*, *daṇḍāsana* and *nārāca* were different kinds of arrows to be delivered by the bow, of which the second and the last are mentioned by Bhāsa. *Nistriṁśa* only among the different types of swords mentioned by Kauṭilya is found in Bhāsa, the others being

1 *Karṇa*, p. 72—समरच्छदपरिकृतः; *Do*, st. 8.

maṇḍalāgra (having a disc at the top) and *asiyaṣṭi* (sharp and long sword); it had a crooked handle. Among the razor-like weapons may be mentioned *paraśu* (a semi-circular scymitar), *kuṭhāra* (axe), *khanitra* (spade) and *paṭṭāsa* (trident shaped *paraśu*). *Ṛṣṭi*, *asi*, *khaḍga*, *karavāla* and *śaṅku* are the other weapons mentioned by Bhāsa. The first four are different kinds of swords, *ṛṣṭi* being a double-edged weapon. *Śaṅku* appears to be a cone-like lance for piercing the body.

Armours were made of iron or of the skins, hoofs and horns of the bison, the elephant, the porpoise or the cow. There were different kinds of armour for the protection of head (*śirastrāṇa*), neck (*kaṇṭhatrāṇa*), trunk (*kūrpāsa*), fingers (*nāgodārikā*), portion upto knee-joints (*kañcuka*), etc. Bhāsa has mentioned *kavaca*, *varma*, *carma* etc.

The simile comparing war to a sacrifice is really interesting and beautiful.[1] The battle rite is lit with the fire of hostility, and in it the trunks of elephants serve as sacrificial posts, the litter of arrows appears, as it were, the sacrificial grass, the pile of slaughtered elephants stands for woodstack, the banners of chariots look like celestial cars, the roar of lions is as if the sacred chant of *mantras*, and the warriors dropping down dead are the victims at the sacrifice.

---

1. Ūru, st. 6. I am indebted to Dr. Sukthankar for drawing my attention to Mahābhārata, V. 141. 29 ff, where there occurs a fully worked out simile elaborately comparing war to a sacrifice in great detail.

CHAPTER XVII.

ARCHITECTURE, SCULPTURE AND ART.

As has been rightly observed by Dr. Acharya, architecture should not merely include public and religious buildings or even civic and domestic architecture, but interior decorations, furniture, etc., as well. Thus, architecture concerns itself not only with temples, arches, forts, palaces, edifices, etc., but also with doors, windows, balconies, floors, roofs, pillars, porches, as well as with bedsteads, couches, tables, chairs, baskets, cages, nests, mills, lamps and lamp-posts.[1] In fact, some of the texts on architecture, including the great *Mānasāra*, refer in detail to all these particulars in architecture. We have dealt with some of the aspects of architecture in earlier chapters concerning "Court Life" and "Urban and Rural Life," though not under suitable paragraphs. That information will be supplemented here with additional details.

In the age of the *Ṛgveda*, we come across stone-forts, walled cities, stone-houses and brick-edifices. The excavations at Mohenjo-Dāro have set at rest the controversy between Fergusson and Rajendralal Mitra as regards the indigenous origin of the Indian (Hindu) architecture, and have once for all justified Dr. Mitra's conclusion. In the Indus culture, we come across such peculiarly Indian ideas and motifs as the open courtyard in a house, elaborate drainage system, separate well and a separate bath-room (ablution room) for every house signifying the sanctity of water or water worship, use of rectangular baked brick, burnt brick and mud mortar,

1 *MR*, Sept., 1934, pp. 281–284; Aug. 1935, pp. 136–137.

absence of true arch, and round column. It appears there were storeyed buildings with flat roofs and a number of rooms on each floor at Mohenjo-Dāro, which was divided into a number of blocks by wide and long roads cutting each other almost perpendicularly.

In the epics also we read of dwelling houses, temples and palaces. In Ayodhyā, in addition to resplendent temples, there were most elegant assembly halls, gardens and alms-houses, with well arranged extensive buildings everywhere. The steeples of houses shone like the crests of mountains and held hundreds of pavilions. The rooms were exquisitely gilt and decorated, and seemed as charming as pictures. The floors were laid evenly. The *Mahābhārata* also speaks of guest houses built in connection with the Rājasūya. They were lofty, most charming in appearance and provided with excellent furniture. They had well built high walls of white colour on all sides and the windows were decorated with jewellery and had golden lattices. The stairs were easy of ascent. The houses were white as the swan, bright as the moon and looked most picturesque even from a distance of four miles. Doors were of uniform height with a variety of quality and inlaid with numerous metal ornaments. There were also charming lakes and ornamental plants by the side of the guest houses. The epics, again, describe cities with special palaces having a number of courts for the king, the princes, the chief priests and civil and military officials. There were also various assembly halls, courts of justice and the booths of small traders with goldsmith's shops and the work-places of other artisans.[1]

Coming next to the Buddhist age, we find that the Buddhist scriptures contain some religious discourses dealing with domestic architecture. Dwelling houses are stated to be of five kinds, and an ordinary residence is said to contain "a sleeping room, a stable, a tower, a one-peaked building, a shop, a boutique, a storeyed house, an attic, a cave, a cell, a store-room, a refectory, a fire-room, a kitchen, a privy, a place to walk in, a house to walk in, a well, a well-house, a weapons-room, a lotus pond, a pavilion, and a bathing place for hot sitting baths".[2] A

1 *MR*, Sept. 1934, p. 282; *Rāmāyaṇa*, I. 5. 10-15. 2 Acharya, *MR*, Sept. 1934, p. 281.

number of articles of furniture is referred to in the Buddhist Canonical texts. Benches to accommodate three persons, bed-stead (*pallaṅka*), couches (*asandi*), rectangular chairs (*asandako*), Sofa, state chair (*bhaddapiṭham*), cane-bottomed chair (*koccham*) are mentioned, as also carpets, rugs, pillows, bolsters, curtains, mosquito curtains, handkerchiefs, etc. Sufficient reference has already been made to the laying out of a city and a palace in the *Arthaśāstra*.

To recapitulate the particulars furnished by our author with regard to architecture in brief, we may state that there were parks both outside and in the hearts of the cities. A courtyard, a tank, a garden and a well were the invariable concomitants of a private dwelling house. Cool summer-houses, luxuriously decorated rooms, well guarded harem, pleasure garden and artificial mountains, lakes, etc. were associated with palaces. In the business quarters of the city there were rows of palatial buildings on both sides of the roads. It appears that the residential quarters were housed caste or sectwise. No particulars are supplied with regard to the aspect and orientation of public and private buildings and no reference is made to any article of furniture.

An important reference to a building of a semi-religious character, *viz.*, the *Pratimāgṛha* (Statue-house), however, occurs in the *Pratimā*.[1] The statue-house was a magnificent structure, taller than even palaces, a monument of architectural skill.[2] It was situated not in the heart of the city, but outside, in the suburban area amidst the trees.[3] To all outward appearances it resembled a temple, the only point of difference being that the statue-house exhibited no external symbols of weapons or flags of the deities; and it was looked on as a shrine.[4] The statue-house was under the control of a care-taker and was open to the public. There was no restriction on entrants, nor was there any door-keeper to prevent entrants.[5]

Special preparations were made in the statue-house on important occasions such as the visit of the queen-

---

1 pp. 59, 66 (III. 13). 2 *Prat*, III. 13—समुच्छ्रयो यस्य स हर्म्यदुर्लभः। 3 *Prat*, p. 59—वृक्षान्तराविष्कृते देवकुले। 4 *Prat* pp. 59, 66—नेह किञ्चित् प्रहरणो ध्वजो वा बहिश्चिह्नं दृश्यते। (p. 59); विना प्रणामं पश्चिकेलभासते। (III. 13). 5 III. 13.

mothers. Not only was the inner dome of the statue-house cleared of its dovecotes, but the walls were whitewashed, the doors were decorated with wreaths and garlands, the paths were spread with white sand, and flowers were scattered everywhere. The walls, further, were anointed with sandal paste by fingers and fried rice also was to be seen scattered.[1] These preparations have much in common with what we see in temples even to this day especially on festive occasions.

These statue-houses bear ample testimony to the advanced stage of architecture in those days. A Śiva temple with a fire-shrine is mentioned in the *Pratijñā*.[2]

Sculpture seems to have attained a very high degree of perfection in the period. The excavations in the Indus valley have shown the antiquity and nature of the statuary of that period and have once for all exploded the myth of Hellenic indebtedness in this connection. The *Jātakas* also testify to perfect statues of elephants and maidens, thus showing a developed stage of the art of the lapidary. Stone works, sculpture of birds and beasts in natural colours with inlaid gems were so exquisitely made that they were often mistaken as live creatures by ordinary visitors. The gild of stone workers or stone cutters in the Buddhist period not only prepared stones to be used for building purposes, but made various artistic articles of stones such as jugs, boxes, cups, etc.

In the period represented by our plays, statues of dead kings used to be carved of stone or granite. They were pieces of exquisite workmanship, and were not mere symbols, but bore human expressions and had remarkable similarities with the original subject.[3] It appears that statues were erected of all dead kings. Each statue brought out or emphasized through some symbol the peculiar characteristic of the king whose statue it was. Thus, in the *Pratimā*, the statue of Dilīpa had something to suggest that he was the embodiment of *dharma*; that of Raghu suggested embodiment of charity, and that of Aja suggested embodiment of love.[4] Similarly, in many old capitals where statues of old kings are kept, the statues

---

1 *Prat*, pp. 54, 59. 2 *Pratijñā*, pp. 39, 47—देवउल···सिव (p. 39); अग्गिगृह (p. 47). 3 *Prat*, p. 59—अहो किमपामापुर्वं पाषाणानाम । अहो भावनतिरस्कृतीनाम् । 4 *Pratimā*, pp. 62-63.

are represented on horseback, if the kings met with their death in battles and in other positions if they died natural deaths.[1] The custom of erecting stone images of dead kings is an ancient one, but it is not yet known from any ancient extant work. These statues were worshipped with fried rice and flowers.[2] Offerings of food are still made to the stone images in Bikaner where all royal personages down from Bika have their statues.[3]

These statues were not exposed to weather as are the busts and statues of many modern celebrities, but were kept in especially built statue-houses, about which we have written earlier. In contrast with the temples which generally contained only one image the statue-houses contained a number of images. As these statues were of the Kṣatriyas, the Brāhmaṇas were naturally not to make any obeisance to them. But other visitors also paid their homage to the dead without prostrating themselves before the statues and without chanting any *mantras*. In the case of sacred images, one had to bow down and chant *mantras* of that particular deity. The statues and statue-houses seem to be unknown in the Kekaya country (a province of the Asuras) in the days of our poet. They were, of course, well known in Ayodhyā.[4]

Dr. Jayaswal placed Bhāsa in the second Century B. C. on the similarity between the Pratimās referred to in the *Pratimā* and the Śaisunāga statues which the learned Doctor relegated to the fifth Century B. C.[5] But the discovery of the statuary in the Indus valley has proved the existence of the art of sculpture in India milleniums before that epoch, and hence Bhāsa, cannot be said not to have lived in the pre-Mauryan age on the score of the alleged absence of any human stone image of the earlier period. The custom of throwing sand in the enclosures of sacred places has been mentioned by Āpastamba alone, and Āpastamba belongs to the fifth century B. C.[6] This fact also indicates the antiquity of Bhāsa. Prof. Pisharoti suspects some connection between the institution of statue-houses and the ancestor worship which is current amongst

1 Cf. Haraprasad Sastri, *OC*, V. pp. 97–98. 2 *Prat*, p. 59—सापुष्पकृष्ण-सक्तविकृता खलः। 3 Haraprasad Śastri, *OC*, V. pp. 97–98. 4 Cf. K. Rama Pisharoti, *QJMS*, XII, pp. 386, 395. 5 *JBORS*, V, pp. 89, 95; cf. also, V. Smith, *JBORS*, V, pp. 512–513. 6 Haraprasad Sastri, *OC*, V. p. 98.

the Nairs in Malabar.[1] He does not, however, elucidate the point regarding the nature of the exact relationship between the two and the historical development of the institution. Possibly, the ancestor worship of the Nairs may be an off-shoot of the worship of the statues. We have already refuted the view that the statue-houses have been copied from Kerala.

Another specimen of fine workmanship in statuary is supplied by the artificial elephant manufactured by king Pradyota Mahāsena of Avanti to capture Udayana Vatsarāja. It was prepared exactly as in the description of a deep blue elephant given in the *Hastiśikṣā*; and the possession of such an elephant was reputed to bring sovereignty to its owner king.[2] We are not definitely told about the material of which the elephant was carved.

Painting. There are many references to painting in our works and there are significant similes describing pictures on a canvass.[3] Pictures were drawn on walls as well as on panels or boards. The walls of the fire-shrine are stated to have got fast-coloured paintings on them.[4] A painter surrounded by many cups is referred to in the *Cārudatta*.[5]

The details about the picture depicting the denuding of Draupadī in the *Dūtavākya* shows that the painter looked to many particulars and minor details.[6] Not only was close attention paid to the dress of all the persons portrayed, but their expression was carefully worked out on the canvass. The portraits of Udayana and Vāsavadattā are said to be quite life-like and to show a remarkable resemblance to the original.[7] Courtesans had a special room in their mansions with all the paraphernalia required for painting. Cultured courtesans like Vasantasenā were well versed in portraiture also, and Vasantasenā's representation of Cārudatta as he was passing by the road below her balcony is said to have been faithfully carried out.[8] At the time of Vātsyāyana, every

1 *QJMS*, XII, p. 396. 2 *Pratijñā*, pp. 9, 10-11—अत्थि एसो चक्कवट्टी इत्थी णीलकुवलअतणू णाम इत्थिसिक्खाए पढिदो। ···दिग्धवारणपडिच्छन्दो···। 3 *Cf. Śiva*, st. 8. 4 *Pratijñā*, p. 40. 5 *Cār*, p. 10—चित्तभरो विअ बहुमल्लपरिखुदो। 6 *Dv*, pp. 9-12—अहो अस्य वर्णाढ्यता। अहो भावोपपन्नता, अहो युक्तलेखता। सुव्यक्तमालिखितोऽयं चित्रपटः। 7 *Svapna*, pp. 134-136—न लहुरी। सैवेति मन्ये। (p. 135). 8 *Cār*, p. 88—चित्तफलए; वत्तिआकरण्डए; सो महिदारओ दीसदि एत्थ।

cultured man had a drawing board *(citraphalaka)* and a vessel *(samudgaka)* of colours.[1]

Music. The musical instruments used by the Indians were generally of four types—*tata* (stringed instruments), *ānaddha* (percussion), *suṣira* (wind instruments) and *ghana* (cymbal). The *Vedas* and the *Brāhmaṇas* refer to various instruments of all these types. The playing of musical instruments was prescribed at sacrifices in the same way as was the singing of the Sāma Hymns. *Viṇā* (lute) was the most popular of instruments, and it was considered as a *ratna* (jewel) obtained without churning the ocean, while the well-known fourteen jewels were extracted from the ocean by churning it.[2] The lute contained seven strings and much resembled the modern Sitar. It was resorted to most by musicians and was appreciated by the general public. Many ladies in high class families also were experts in playing on lute and in singing, and their consorts enjoyed nights in listening to the enchanting tunes of music.[3] Among wind instruments were used flutes made of reed *(vaṁśa)*.[4] Vocal music also was much popular, and kings felt no compunction in engaging tutors for giving lessons to the princesses in music. Not only courtesans but ladies of respectable families also learnt the art of dancing. An accomplished courtesan was an expert in all branches of music.

The art of weaving seems to have reached a developed phase in the period in that the garments made from barks of trees were so finely produced as not to be easily distinguishable from the ordinary cotton garments.[4] Florists, perfumers, garland-makers, jewellers and goldsmiths are the other artisans and craftsmen mentioned by Bhāsa.

---

1 Chakladar, *Social Life*, p. 188. 2 *Cār.* p. 64—वीणा नामासमुद्रोत्थितं रत्नम्।
3 Cf. *Avi*, pp. 43-44; III. 5, 6. 4 Cf. *Pratī*. I, 9.

CHAPTER XVIII.

RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY, LITERATURE AND SCIENCES.

The poet was a follower of orthodox Hinduism and all the principal characters owe allegiance to that faith. Naturally, therefore, Hinduism should be given first place in our study of religion.

Oblation and prayer constituted Vedic worship. The sacred fire was lighted in the house of every householder and he chanted the beautiful and simple hymns now incorporated in the *Ṛgveda*. The deities in the Vedic age were chiefly manifestations of nature. Out of a number of gods to whom prayers are offered in the Vedas, the principal gods are said to be thirty-three. Indra, Sūrya, Varuṇa, Aśvina were the important deities. Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism which were developed in later epochs are found in their embryonic stage in the Vedic age. Viṣṇu and Rudra (forerunner of Śiva) are but minor gods in the Vedas. It cannot be said that Śiva worship has been incorporated later on by the Aryans in their religious books, and that it is copied from the aboriginal non-Aryans. There is, of course, no reference to *liṅga* worship in the *Ṛgveda*, and it appears to have been current among some sections of the Mohenjo-Dāro people. Phallic worship as such found its place in some Hindu sects at a later date. Śiva and Śakti (or mother) worship is found prevalent among the ancient people of the Indus valley.

The *Brāhmaṇas* emphasized the sacrificial aspect and the *Upaniṣads* probed into philosophical speculations.

Viṣṇu and Śiva rose into prominence after the period of the Vedas. The first germs of the tendency of placing either of the gods at the head of everything and of proclaiming everything as proceeding from either of them are to be seen in the *Upaniṣads*. Thus the *Kaṭhopaniṣad* proclaims the superiority of Viṣṇu, and the *Śvetāśvatara*, that of Śiva. Yet we do not meet with any disputes among the devotees of both the gods which are found later on when the worshippers of these gods formed themselves into different systems as Vaiṣṇavas and Śaivas. Barring the professed sectarian writings, there has always been an attempt on the part of the writers of the epics, the *Purāṇas*, etc., to show the unity of these two gods and to prove their equality by depicting Viṣṇu as praising Śiva and the latter as praising Viṣṇu. In the *Mahābhārata*, we find mention also of Skanda, Dattātreya, Durgā, etc. Different accounts are given as to the birth of Skanda. Skanda was not included in the Vedic pantheon. It appears that devotion to Skanda was practised on a greater scale in the *Mahābhārata* age than during the subsequent periods. Patañjali refers to the worship of Śiva, Skanda, and Viśākha in the Mauryan age.[1] The *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas* give various accounts of the birth of Skanda who is also known as Kārtikeya, Ṣaḍānana, Śaravaṇabava, Senānī, Krauñcadāraṇa, etc., most of the epithets having reference to the circumstance of his birth. Śiva cast his seed into Agni who was sent by Indra. Being unable to bear it, Agni cast it into the Ganges, from where it was transferred to the six Kṛttikās when they came to bathe in the Ganges. Each of the Kṛttikās conceived and brought forth a son, all the six sons being mysteriously combined afterwards into one extraordinary form with six heads and twelve hands and eyes (hence Kārtikeya, Ṣaḍānana, Ṣaṇmukha, Ṣāṇmātura, etc.). Another account relates that the Ganges cast the seed of Śiva into a thicket of reeds (*Śaravaṇa*) whence the boy was called Śaravaṇabhava or Śarajanman. Yet another account makes him the son of Agni through his consort Svāhā who had assumed the forms of six Ṛṣipatnīs (hence Svāheya). Kārtikeya is the Mars or the god of War of the Indian mythology and was the commander-in-chief of the army of gods in their war with Tārakāsura (hence

1 *Mahābhāṣya*, (Benares Edition), V. 3, 2, p. 73.

Senānī, Tārakajit). He is called Skanda because he was born of scattered seed or because he scattered the demons. He is said to have pierced the mountain Krauñca. Though some *Purāṇas* refer to his wife, Kārtikeya is universally believed to have led a celibate life, whence he is known as Brahmacārī, and women are forbidden to pay a homage to him. He is represented as riding a peacock.[1]

Durgā, the goddess, was known in the epic period in different forms. She was worshipped as Śakti. She is also identified with Yogamāyā, the daughter of Yaśodā who flew into the air as Kaṁsa dashed her against a stone.

In the Buddhist age, there appears to be a tendency to deprecate Brahmanic gods. Worshippers of the Sun, the Moon, Agni, Brahmā, Vāsudeva, Baladeva, the Elephant, the Horse, the Cow, and the Dog are spoken in words of contempt in the same breath.[2] However, Vedic gods and Hindu religion held their own even in Buddhist India. The *Arthaśāstra* speaks of the temples of Lakṣmī (Aparājitā), Viṣṇu (Apratihata), Skanda (Jayanta), Indra (Vaijayanta), Śiva, Kubera (Vaiśravaṇa) and Durgā (Madirā).[3]

In our plays, we find that the following deities were worshipped; Viṣṇu (and his many forms), Śiva, Kārtyāyanī, Skanda, Balarāma, Yakṣiṇī, etc. It would, of course, be wrong to generalize from the partiality our poet shows to Viṣṇu that Vaiṣṇavism was more common. The poet evidently was a worshipper of Viṣṇu. The idea of ten incarnations of Viṣṇu is pretty old in Indian mythology and our poet has mentioned Varāha, Vāmana, Nṛsiṁha, Rāma and Kṛṣṇa as manifestations of Viṣṇu.[4] A late date was sought to be ascribed to our plays on the ground that divinity was attached to Kṛṣṇa and Rāma at a late period. We find that Vāsudeva was worshipped at the time of Pāṇini and Buddha, and even Megasthenes refers to the worship of Kṛṣṇa.[5] Inscriptional evidence in favour of temples dedicated to Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa in the centuries

---

1 Chitrav, *Bhāratavarṣīya Prācīna Caritrakośa*; Apte's Sanskrit-English Dictionary. 2 Cf. Joshi, *Aravinda*, 1921, p. 351; *Jātaka*, IV, p. 113. 3 *Arthaśāstra*, II. 4, pp. 55-56. 4 Cf. Benedictory stanzas in the *Avi*, *Bāl* and *Mv* refer to Vāmana, *Avi* referring to Varāha in addition; the benedictory stanza in the *Karṇa* refers to Nṛsiṁha, and the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* plays refer to Rāma and Kṛṣṇa. 5 Cf. *Pāṇini*, IV. 3. 98; *Niddesa* ; Macdonell, *HSL*, p. 411.

before Christ is indisputable.[1] No incontrovertible proofs are found regarding Rāma's inclusion as the incarnation of Viṣṇu at so early a period; but on general grounds, we may safely say that by the pre-Mauryan epoch, Rāma was also looked upon as a form of Viṣṇu. We are inclined to hold that at the period of our poet, when Buddhism was in its infancy, and vigorous propaganda in its favour was in full swing, there were people who denied divinity to Kṛṣṇa and lightly treated him as a mere cowherd.[2] The weapons of Kṛṣṇa were also regarded as divine and capable of achieving any object. As already observed, Bhāsa was the first to invest these weapons with human form and bring them on the stage. They are advised to proceed to Gokula in the guise of cowherds.[3] There was no unhealthy rivalry between Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism and no attempts were made to impress the superiority of either of them over the other. Śiva was worshipped and so was his divine consort, Kārtyāyanī. Kārtyāyanī is said to be the divine child of Yaśodā which was dashed against stone by Kaṁsa, but instead of being dead, the child burst into two. The divine weapons of Kārtyāyanī are shown as appearing on the stage to praise her. They include Kuṇḍodara, Saṅkukarṇa, Nila and Manojava, and they also are advised to go disguised as cowherds to Gokula along with the disguised Kārtyāyanī.[4]

Skanda is said to have proceeded from the grove of arrows or reeds.[5] His feats of killing Krauñca and Mandara are referred to a number of times.[6] In connection with the praise of Balarāma, it may be mentioned that there were temples dedicated to Balarāma in the epic age.[7] Balarāma plays an important part in the Pañcarātra system (about which we shall speak later on), and our poet appears to be a follower of the system. There were temples of Yakṣiṇīs and maidens used to worship them. Kālāṣṭamī is mentioned as a special day for worshipping the Yakṣiṇī.[8] We do not think that Yakṣiṇīs were evil spirits, at least in the period we are dealing with.[9] In Aśoka's time, they appear to have lost

---

1 Bhandarkar, *EI*, XXII, pp. 198-205. 2 *Do.* pp. 7, 26—स गोपालकस्तव पुरुषोत्तमः। (p. 7), कथं कथं गोपालक इति। (p. 26). 3 Cf. *Bāl*, p. 17. 4 Cf. *Bāl*, p. 33. 5 *Pratijñā*, II. 2. 6 Cf. *Bāl*, II. 23; III. 9; *Abh*, I. 24; VI. 7; *Prat*, V. 12; etc. 7 Cf. Vaidya, *Upasaṁhāra*, p. 521. 8 Cf. *Pratijñā*, भगवतीए जक्खिणीए ठाणं तस्सि देवकय्यं कतु। 9 Jayaswal, *JASB*, IX, p. 262; Ghatak. *JDL*, XII, p. 30.

respectable followers and to have degenerated into genii. Curiously enough, we find belief in the half male and half female godhead—the Ardhanārīśvara form of Śiva.[1] It may not be supposed that this form connotes a later phase of Hindu society as we find it prevalent among the Mohenjo-Dāro people.

Turning to another aspect of Hinduism, *viz.* idol-worship, we find that there is absolutely no mention of idols in the *Ṛgveda*, nor is there any reference to temples or public places of worship where people were to congregate, though the ancient Vedic Aryans worshipped thirty three gods. In the opinion of Mr. Kunte, the Aryans showed a leaning towards idolatory in the third period of the Vedic polity, *viz.*, that of the *Vājasaneyi* and *Taittiriya Saṁhitās*.[2] The Indus civilization clearly shows the existence of iconic and aniconic worship.[3] Idol-worship, however, did not form part of the daily duties of the Vedic Aryans. The *Gṛhya Sūtras* which regulate the life of the householders are silent as to the particulars of the worship of the idols of gods. By the period of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*, we find that there were erected public temples dedicated to Viṣṇu, Śiva, Skanda, etc.[4] Yet the *Gṛhya Sūtras* do not prescribe idol-worship in the daily *nityakarmas* in the epic age. The existence of temples and images at the time of the epics gives a direct lie to the view that the advent of Buddhism brought in its wake idol-worship. Pāṇini's silence as to idol-worship is rather difficult to explain. The Buddhists did not sanction idolatory during the first and second periods of their history. One is struck with wonder by the comparatively small number of temples in such a big city as Vaiśālī in the Buddhist period. The temples were then known by the names of their owners. Indra and Varuṇa among the Vedic gods were worshipped, and Viṣṇu was but an unimportant deity, being mentioned in the *Mahāsamayasutta* among minor gods. No reference is found to Śiva, Gaṇapati, Dattātreya and Devī; and Rāma and Kṛṣṇa were held as mere historical personages.[5] Patañjali clearly refers to the images of Śiva, Skanda and

---

1 *Ave*, II. 12—वासपर्वनातीश्वररूपोमान् । 2 *Vicissitudes of Aryan Civilization*, pp. 331-332. 3 Marshall, *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilisation*. 4 *Rāmāyaṇa*, II. 6. 4, 11; 95, 4; 71. 41; Vaidya, *Upanaṁhāra*, pp. 427-429. 5 Cf. Joshi, *Aravinda*, 1921, p. 351; *Dasaratha* and *Ghaṭa Jātakas*.

Viśākha existing in the Mauryan age and we have already indicated the existence of idolatory in the later Vedic age. The *Arthaśāstra* speaks of the images of gods in a number of places testifying to the prevalence of the custom of idol-worship. It is worth noting that the death sentence was prescribed by Kauṭilya to one who stole the idols of gods.[1]

In the period represented by our plays, we find that idol-worship was in a developed stage. Regular temples dedicated to various deities were built in the hearts of the cities. It appears that temples contained large enclosures and there were tanks in the premises. There were also some smaller buildings in the main temple, such as fire-shrine, etc. The walls had on them paintings of different scenes.[2] In a prominent place in a temple so as to be easily visible from outside even from a distance were placed symbols or weapons of the particular deity that was enshrined.[3] Thus there was a bull or trident to denote a Śiva temple, an eagle or a monkey to denote a Viṣṇu temple and so on. There were daily festivities in some temples, while in others the full-moon day was observed as a festive occasion.[4] Special preparations on such days were similar to those we have noted in connection with the statue-houses. Though a temple ordinarily contained one image, it was not rare to come across more than one idol in a temple.[5] Thus, Bharata took the statue-house as a temple containing four images. In the Śiva temple at Ujjayinī, there were also the images of Skanda and Kārtyāyanī.[6] According to Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri, the term *Bahmaārī* (*Brahmacārī*) in the *Pratijñā* (p. 71) refers to Ganādhipa; and this has been taken to signify the prevalence of the worship of Gaṇapati at the time of Bhāsa. Gaṇeśa-worship, no doubt, goes back to ancient times;[7] but there is no particular authority for equating Brahmacārī with Gaṇādhipa in contravention of ordinary usage. The term Brahmacārī is generally taken to cover only Skanda and Śiva; and in the context in the *Pratijñā*, in the absence of any special allusion to Gaṇapati, it

1 *Arthaśāstra*, pp. 142, 144, 391, 393, 398, etc. IV. 10, p. 229—देवपशुप्रतिमामनुष्यक्षेत्रगृहहिरण्यसुवर्णरत्नसस्योपहारिण उत्तमो दण्डः शुद्धवधो वा। 2 Cf. *Pratijñā*, III, pp. 30, 40, 47. 3 *Prat*, p. 59—नेह किञ्चित् प्रहरणं ध्वजो वा परिश्रितं दृश्यते। 4 *Prat*, p. 59—किन्नु खलु पार्वणोऽयं विशेषः, अथवा आह्निकमास्तिक्यम्। 5 *Prat*, p. 59—किन्नु खलु चतुर्देवतोऽयं स्तोमः। 6 *Pratijñā*, p. 39—कथा अग्नी and ब्रह्मचारी। 7 Getty, *Ganeśa*, p. 10.

seems that Skanda is referred to. We have already written about the prevalence of Skanda worship in ancient India.

Reference has already been made at different places to the importance attached to the institution of sacrifice and its popularity in the period.

Śrāddha, or offering funeral oblations to the dead ancestors was then, as it is even now, an important duty of the Hindus. Every one, rich or poor, tried to execute it to the best of his ability and means. Rāma's anxiety to celebrate the death anniversary of his father in a suitable fashion in order that it may not pain his dead father signifies the importance of the function even to an ordinary person.[1] Though, whatever was given in true faith constituted a *Śrāddha*, every one strove to ensure pleasure and happiness to the manes, if there was some means of knowing about it through the *Dharmaśāstras*.[2] Offering of *bali* to the *Mātṛkas*, *Bhūtas* and other beings and placing lamps on the street-points also constituted an important daily duty of a householder in the epic age; and Cārudatta, though reduced to poverty, is seen to observe the injunction according to his means.[3]

Buddhism. The flourishing condition of sacrifices against which Buddha led his campaign would suggest that Buddhism had not yet gained ground. Not to speak of the royalty, it does not appear to have found favour even with the commoners. The Buddhist mendicants were lightly spoken of as conjurers and the offering of peace from a Buddhist was taken as a disgrace. The Buddhist laymen were also ridiculed as *unmattopāsakas* (mad worshippers).[4] The reference in the *Cārudatta* (Act III. p. 74—कत्तव्वकरित्तीकिदसंकेदो विअ सक्किअसमणओ।)which is generally interpreted as a reflection on the low morality of the Buddhist Bhikṣus, seems to be due to a wrong meaning attached to the word कत्तव्वकरित्तीकिदसंदो in the sentence. The passage has been translated: "A Buddhist monk that has made an assignation with a girl servant", relying on the conjectural emendation कत्तव्वकरत्थी proposed by Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri. Dr. Johnston,

---

1 *Prat*, pp. 96-97. 2 *Prat*, pp. 99-100. 3 *Cār*, pp. 26-27. 4 *Pratijñā*, pp. 43, 44, 45, 46—अयं बहुणमावं। वेदामलएण समणएण। (p. 43); उम्मत्तोपासक (pp. 44, 45); पेक्ख पेक्ख ममत्तभावं। (p. 45).

however, finds in the passage a reference to the practice known as *jāgarikā* and translates: "Like a Buddhist monk who has been emancipated from worldly knowledge by following the path to Arhatship, namely by practising *jāgarikā*". Though Dr. Johnston would not accept the common authorship of the Trivandrum plays, nor the authorship of Bhāsa in the case of the *Cārudatta*, nor also the antiquity we assign to Bhāsa, he regards the *Cārudatta* as early, because the above-mentioned passage "indicates a time when *Hinayāna* was still flourishing and familiarity with its practices could be presumed in a non-Buddhist audience".[1] This passage taken in conjunction with the other references to Buddhism in our plays shows that on the whole the plays correctly depict the period of the beginning of Buddhism in India.

Jainism. Jainism, the other religious system, also was not favourably viewed. The Jainas were taken as non-Vaidikas,—non-believers in the *Vedas*. The Digambara sect only appears to have been known to our poet. The other sect was promulgated at the time of Candragupta Maurya.[2]

Both these religious systems were looked upon as heretical. It is interesting to note in this connection that Kauṭilya classifies the followers of both these systems with the Śūdras, and interdining with them or even inviting them for dinner on religious festivities was prohibited under penalty of fine. The *caityas* or *vihāras* were ordered to be built outside the cities in the *Arthaśāstra*.[3]

Philosophy. The Pāñcarātra system of philosophy which was an offshoot of the *Bhagavadgītā* philosophy and the fore-runner of Bhāgavatism, seems to have been the creed of the author of the plays. The tenets of the system are explained in the Śāntiparvan of the *Mahābhārata*.[4] Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa is taken as an

---

1 *IA*, 1933, pp. 116-117. कतम्बकरित्ती is changed to कतम्बकरत्थी (कर्तव्यकरस्त्री) and the latter is taken to signify *Paricārikā*, a girl servant. But as stated by Dr. Johnston, कतम्बक in Pali means the task an aspirant has to perform to become an *arhat*; *vitta* in Pali means 'emancipated' and *anāketa* is either a characteristic trait or wordly usage. Thus Dr. Johnston arrives at the meaning stated above. 2 *Ays*, pp. 15, 72. 3 *Arthaśāstra*, III. 20, p. 199—शाक्याजीवकादीन् कृपलप्रव्रजितान् देवपितृकार्येषु भोजनशालायां दृष्ट्वा; also II. 4, p. 56—पाषण्डचण्डालानां श्मशानान्ते वासः। 4 Cf. Vaidya, *Upasaṁhāra*, pp. 63-64; 518-529; *Jñānakosa* (Marathi), Vol. IV, pp. 113-118.

incarnation of Viṣṇu, and the devotion of Kṛṣṇa is the basic principle of the Pañcarātra system. Vāsudeva is supposed to be beyond the twentyfour principles, permanent, unborn, everlasting. He is all-pervading and the inner soul of all. He is the prime creator. Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha are but his different forms. At the time of the deluge the earth dissolves in water, the latter in fire, the fire in wind, the wind in ether, and the ether in the unmanifest Prakṛti, which in its turn dissolves in the Puruṣa, which is none else but Vāsudeva. Thus he alone remains after the deluge. In the next creation, human bodies are born of five elements and Vāsudeva enters them in the invisible atomic form. This *jīva* form is known as Saṅkarṣaṇa. Mind, which is born of this Saṅkarṣaṇa *(jīva)* is known by the name Pradyumna. The Ahaṁkāra or egoism that comes through mind is termed Aniruddha. The idea of ten incarnations of Viṣṇu as stated in the *Mahābhārata* appears to have been started before Buddhism rose into prominence, as it does not include Buddha as an incarnation.[1] Haṁsa is said to be the first incarnation but no information is supplied about the same. The Pañcarātra system fully obeys the authority of the *Vedas* and the Vedic sacrifices, but does not favour slaughter of animals even in sacrifices. It is also known as the Sātvatadharma as it was current among the Vṛṣṇis. Devotion of Viṣṇu, practice of *tapas*, acceptance of the infallibility of the *Vedas* and *Āraṇyakas* and the principle of non-killing are the main characteristics of the Pañcarātra system. It has a long history of its own being in vogue at least since the time of Pāṇini.

In our plays we find references to some of the incarnations of Viṣṇu. Balarāma, who is a great personality in the Pañcarātra system, is praised in a benedictory stanza in one of our plays. One of the plays, again, goes under the name *Pañcarātra*. Glorification of Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa is to be met with at many places in these plays.

---

1 Cf. *Mahābhārata*, XII. 339. 103-104 :

हंसः कूर्मश्च मत्स्यश्च प्रादुर्भावाद्विजोत्तम ॥
वराहो नारसिंहश्च वामनो राम एव च ।
रामो दाशरथिश्चैव सात्वती कल्किरेव च ॥

The theory of rebirth seems to have been accepted.[1] The *Upaniṣadic* ideas about the five senses and sense organs etc. were well known to the general public so as to be ordinarily intelligible when used in a dramatic piece.[2]

Languages and Literature. Sanskrit, as already observed, was the spoken language of the literate, cultured class, and Prakrit was that of women and low people. The distinction of the use of different languages by different characters as enunciated in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* was not based on an arbitrary whim, but on the actual state of affairs in ancient India. In the period of our poet, both the languages were in actual use and not confined to mere books as 'Literary Languages'.

In addition to the various ancient treatises on different sciences mentioned in the *Pratimā* which learned Brāhmaṇas in those days used to be proficient in, a work on Hastiśikṣā seems to have been well known.[3] In the absence of any information about this *Hastiśikṣā* besides its mere name, it is impossible to identify it with any known work. About the *Nāṭyaśāstra* referred to in the *Avimāraka* we have already indicated that this may have been an ancient treatise on the *Nāṭyaśāstra* laid under contribution by Bharata, or an earlier version of Bharata himself, or possibly a work on dramaturgy by Bhāsa himself[4] That the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* were quite known and studied in the period would follow from the number of plays based on the epics. It cannot, however, be definitely ascertained which particular version or recension of the *Mahābhārata* our poet had studied, as it is quite possible that the changes from the epic introduced by the poet may have been his own innovations rather than based on different texts of the epic. There is not much of a difference between the *Rāmāyaṇa* text of our poet and our present text; many of the variations observed in the *Pratimā* from the *Rāmāyaṇa* are obviously of the poet's own creation for dramatic effect. It seems that the poet knew the *Bhagavadgītā* as he has merely copied the *Bhagavadgītā*, II. 37 in the *Karṇabhāra*, Stanza 12, and *Abhiṣeka*, p. 38 n 4. Again, the stanza

---

1 *Cru*, st. 50—अन्वस्यामपि आत्मा मे त्वमेव जननी भव ।; also *Avi*. II. 1—जातिस्मरः प्रथमजातिमिव स्मरामि । 2 E. g. *Pañc*, I. 10. 3 *Prat*, p. 99; also *Pratijñā*, p. 9. 4 See Supra, pp. 129–132.

भीष्मद्रोण etc. which occurs in the Gītādhyāna, which has been subsequently added by its composer, has been taken with slight differences from Bhāsa (*Ūrubhaṅga*, stanza 1). It may also be noted that the first foot of a stanza from the *Bālacarita* (II. 24) used in connection with a weapon of Kārtyāyanī, occurs in the famous *Rāmarakṣāstotra* in praise of Hanūmat. We do not find the mention of any other literary work in our plays.

Astronomy and Astrology. The first elementary knowledge of the astronomical science is to be met with in the *Ṛgveda* itself. The year was divided into twelve lunar months and a thirteenth or intercalary month was added to adjust the lunar with the solar year. Some *nakṣatras* are named in the *Ṛgveda* and the position of the moon with regard to the *nakṣatras* is alluded to. The lunar zodiac was finally settled in the epic period.[1] Some *tithis* and *nakṣatras* only are mentioned by our poet; there is no reference to the names of the days of the week, which appear to have been known to Indians in the epic period. The *rāśis* entered the Indian astrology after Hellenic intercourse and hence naturally they are not mentioned in our plays as also in the *Arthaśāstra*. The moon was known to be the cause of the tides.[2] If the reading proposed by Prof. Bhide be accepted, it would seem that there was an observatory at Ujjayinī and the time of sun rise was known by observations and calculations.[3]

It appears that there was some belief in astrology in the period. The astrologers of those days based their forecasts and proclaimed auspicious and inauspicious moments on their knowledge of the *nakṣatras*. *Rohiṇī* was thought auspicious for the entry of a prince into the city while *kṛttikā* was not suited for the purpose.[4] Marriages were also celebrated on auspicious *nakṣatras*.[5] In the *Jātakas*, however, we find that the science of astrology was ridiculed and no stars or horoscopes were consulted before settling marriages. No marriage engagement could be broken in the Buddhist age simply

---

1 Datta, *Early Hindu Civilisation*, pp. 173-174. 2 *Abh.* VI. 2—उदधिरिव विभाति शुद्धभूमौ रघुवरचन्द्रशरांशुवृद्धवेगा। 3 P. 81, Bhide's Edition. *Svapna*, p. 102—'उदङ्मुखानि'; Sarup rejects this reading (*Visions*, notes, p. 134) and Dhruva proposes to drop the whole sentence (*Svapnani Sundari*, p. 67). 4 *Pratī*, p. 58. 5 Cf. *Svapna*, p. 49; *Avi*, pp. 90-91.

on account of unfavourable stars. The *Jātakas* call fortune-telling and interpretation of dreams as false trades (*mithyājīva*). Kauṭilya also passes depreciatory remarks about the tendency to consult the stars too much; for, according to him wealth passes away from such a person.[1]

Medicines. A number of herbs was known, some particulars about which will be told in the next chapter. *Cāṅgerikā* was reputed to bring coolness to the head. Other cooling and healing balms were also prepared from *Bakula, Sarja, Sarala, Nīpa, Kadamba,* etc., and their local application was reputed to give instantaneous relief.[2] The psychological aspect of diseases was not lost sight of and the sick room was well decorated to divert the attention of the patient.[3]

---

1 *Arthaśāstra*, IX. 4. p. 351—नक्षत्रमतिपृच्छन्तं कालश्चौतिवर्तते। अर्थो ह्यर्थस्य नक्षत्रं किं करिष्यन्ति तारकाः॥ 2 *Avi*, pp. 80-81. 3 *Svapna*. V. 4.

CHAPTER XIX.

SOCIAL LIFE.

In this chapter we shall deal with those aspects of the social life of the period which could not adequately be included among the earlier chapters or whose importance demanded a separate treatment under different headings.

FOOD AND DRESS.

Both vegetable and animal food was taken by the Indians in the Vedic age. Barley and wheat were the principal products of land and the principal articles of food. There is no mention of rice in the *Ṛgveda*, which appears to have entered the diet of the Indians at a later period. Various sweet cakes such as *apūpa*, *puroḍāśa*, *karambha*, etc. which were prepared in ghee are referred to. Animal food was largely used and frequent allusions are found to the cooking of cows, buffaloes and bulls. A slaughter-house where cows were killed is mentioned as also the sacrifice of horses, bulls and rams. The allusions to the horse-sacrifice, however, are rare, from which it appears that the custom of eating horse flesh fell into disuse. The rarity of the Aśvamedha sacrifice in later times, it being reserved for sovereigns, also speaks of the general disfavour against killing horses and eating their flesh. The only intoxicating drink in the Vedic age was the fermented juice of Soma.[1] Milk with its various preparations has ever been a most favourite food in India since the ancient times, and it must also have been an important factor in the dietary of the Mohenjo-Dāro

1 Datta, *Early Hindu Civilisation*, pp. 41-43; Majumdar, *Outline*, pp. 49-50.

people, besides wheat, barley, vegetables and other fruits including the date. Animal food comprised beef, mutton, pork, poultry and the flesh of the gharial, turtle, tortoise, and dried and fresh fish.[1]

In the Brahmanic and the Upaniṣadic period, various kinds of grains are mentioned in addition to the meat of animals. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* enumerates ten kinds of seeds. Grains were ground and sprinkled with honey, curds and clarified butter, and made into different kinds of cakes. Rice, barley, beans and sesamums, ghee, butter, curds and sugar-cane were the principal vegetable food-stuffs. Animal food was also taken. The flesh of cow and bull made favourite dishes. References are found to the fattening and killing of an ox or cow when a king or an honoured guest was received. Surā or a brandy made from corn and barley was generally drunk.[2]

It was by the epic period that restrictions were placed on meat-eating and wine-drinking, especially by the Brāhmaṇas. The killing of animals on occasions of sacrifice was not taken as slaughter, and all, including the Brāhmaṇas, partook of the flesh as it was taken to be sacred. The cow and the bull were, however, raised to divinity in the epic period principally through Śrī Kṛṣṇa and the killing of a cow was regarded as a great sin and the eating of their flesh was forbidden to all the Hindus. Fish of some kinds, frogs and birds etc. were prohibited for the Brāhmaṇas. Gradually as it became known that meat tended to hinder progress in penance and was harmful for high thinking, the general tendency came to be against flesh-eating and is well represented in the famous verse:

न मांसभक्षणे दोषो न मद्ये न च मैथुने।
प्रवृत्तिरेषा भूतानां निवृत्तिस्तु महाफला॥

The only exception was in the case of sacrifices. The Kṣatriyas of the epic period were noted for their addiction to liquor. But the Brāhmaṇas were strictly prohibited from drinking, and later on, it was regarded as one of the five principal sins.

In the *Jātakas* there does not appear to be any restriction with regard to food and drink. We read of

1 Marshall, *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization*, p. 27; Sewell, *Mohenjo-Daro and Indus Civilization*, pp. 870 ff. 2 Dutta, *Op cit*, p. 166.

Brāhmaṇa meat-eaters and of Brāhmaṇas enjoying spirituous drinks. Brāhmaṇas used to kill a goat at a feast for the dead or to feed the wedding guest with a fattened pig. Inspite of the campaign of Buddhism against sacrifices, large numbers of sheep, goats, poultry, swine and other living creatures were massacred at Benares for sacrificial rites. Fish, meat, strong drink, rice and milk were offered to the Nāgas. Many also are the allusions to drinking festivals and some tipplers.[1]

Slaughter-houses were under government control in the period of the *Arthaśāstra* and none was allowed to kill animals or sell meat outside. Slaughter of milch cows, calves and bulls was prohibited. Though not expressly stated, we think there were at least some restrictions regarding flesh-eating among the Brāhmaṇas if it cannot be definitely asserted that flesh was prohibited. The observations of Megasthenes that wine was drunk but rarely and that rice beer was generally drunk seem to be correct. The Abkari department was under state control, and the sale and purchase of wine was looked into by the superintendent of drinking houses. No one was allowed to sell drinks without permit and outside the licensed houses.[2]

In our plays, we find that articles from the vegetarian menu are generally mentioned. A piece of mutton saturated with salt and ghee is referred to as being placed in a drinking bowl; the reference evidently is to the drunken Gātrasevaka who is not a Brāhmaṇa and thus it appears that flesh-eating was not current in those days especially among the Brāhmaṇas.[3] The similes of the gluttonous jesters as well as their enumeration of the various articles of diet do not cover the non-vegetarian field. Sugar-balls (*modakamallaka*), ghee (*ghidam*), molasses (*gulam*), clarified butter or buttermilk (*dahim*), rice (*taṇḍulā*) and rice-cake fried in ghee (*neubbhāmaṇa*, according to Dr. Rājā) are the different food-stuffs mentioned.[4] Condiments of various kinds were used to flavour dishes. At the time of Vātsyāyana, the city-bred gentlemen had two meals a day and their articles of diet consisted of rice, wheat, barley, pulses, variety of

1 *Jātaka*, Nos. 47, 81, 227, 469, 480, 497, 512, 537, 543, 545, 546, etc. 2 *Arthaśāstra*, II. 26, 25, pp. 122-123; 119-121; CHI, I, pp. 412-413. 3 *Pratimā*, p. 57—चिदमरिअवेणकलिदे मंसखण्डे। 4 *Cār*, p. 4.

vegetables, milk and its preparations, ghee, meat, sweets, salt and oil. Desisting from flesh-eating was considered an act of merit. They also enjoyed various kinds of drinks such as *surā*, *madhu*, *maireya* and *āsava*.[1] In Bhāsa, we find reference to the sale of liquor in a public tavern.[2] Though the servant there is not really drunk but feigns to be under the influence of liquor, it may safely be inferred from contemporary accounts that the public drinking houses were under the superintendence and control of government officials.

As regards dress, Indians used to wear two pieces of cloth for a long time since the Vedic age. The dress of the ancient Indus people consisted of a shawl-like upper garment worn over the left shoulder and under the right arm, recalling the *upavita* mode discovered during the later Vedic age. The lower garment was possibly a kilt. There is nothing to distinguish between the male and female attire and it appears that the garments were of wool or cotton. The lower garment in the epic age was passed round the waist and covered the lower limbs; the *uttariya* (upper garment) was loosely worn round the shoulders. The upper part of the body was not always wholly covered by the garment; mostly it was uncovered. The pupils kept their right arm free for movements and tied the knot of the upper garment over their left shoulders. The general populace had cotton garments, while those of the royalty and the rich were of silk and muslin. The upper garments of the fashionable city-bred gentlemen were generally scented.[4] It appears that the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas dressed themselves differently in Ayodhyā, while there was no such distinction in the Kekaya country.[5] Occasionally a turban was worn round the head by important personages and kings. Ornaments of gold and jewellery were worn on their wrists, necks, etc. both by the males and females. Shoes were generally worn in the epic age and they were made of wood or leather. Clothes made of grass were usually worn by anchorites both male and female. *Valkalas* were bark-garments prepared from the barks of trees.

---

1 Chakladar, *Social Life*, pp. 159-160. 2 *Pratijñā*, Act IV, Praveśaka. 3 Venkateswara, *AP*, 1934, p. 88. 4 *Cār*, p. 36. 5 *Prat*; III, 3; also p. 61; Cf. Pisharoti, *QJMS*, XII, p. 388.

FESTIVITIES, SPORTS AND PASTIMES.

Primitive man was a gregarious animal and the tendency continued till a comparatively late period in the Vedic age. The Vedic Indian used to amuse himself in chariot-racing and hunting. There were also festive assemblies in which there was much of music and dance. At the occasion of sacrifices and such other great assemblies, many diversions were found in which all took part. The amusements, festivities and sports of the Hindus are characteristically wound up with some religious ceremony or episode, and there is possibly nothing in the life of the Hindus which is not connected with religion, ritual or moral duty in some way or the other. Some festivities occur in the form of thanks-givings, or to greet the arrival of seasons, etc. Till a very late period when the *Smṛti* writers curtailed the freedom of women and paved their way with thorns, women used to mix freely in all such festivities and gatherings.

The *Kārtika* festival was an occasion of great rejoicing in the Buddhist age and the city was swept clean and was decorated with banners, garlands and buntings, and scents and perfumes were to be found everywhere. The city is said to have appeared like some city of the gods. The king marched in the city in pompous procession at sunset when the full moon had risen in the sky and every quarter in the city was blazing with torches. Citizens of both sexes in their best dress and ornaments took part in the sport connected with the festival which was at times characterized by strong drinks.[1]

There are references to a number of sports and festivities in our plays. *Indramaha* and *Dhanurmaha* were, it appears, the festivals of the cowherds. The city used to be decorated for the *Dhanurmaha* and a vast stadium was specially prepared for wrestling bouts and other feats such as the bending of a special bow etc., connected with the festival. The king sent invitations to a number of celebrated wrestlers and citizens to attend the festival. The king himself attended the main fights and observed them from the balcony of his palace. *Indramaha* was a ceremony connected with Indra and the

1 Jātaka Nos. 147, 150, 276, 528.

cowherds used to offer oblations of food to Indra on the occasion.[1] Another special sport in which the herdsmen took part was the *Hallīsaka*.[2] It was a circular dance performed by women under the direction of one man or in which the circle consisted of males and females alternately arranged.

Wrestling was a favourite pastime and even princes were fond of it.[3] There were also tournaments in which charming and accomplished maidens were the prize of the victorious athlete. They appear to have been popular in cities ruled by semi-republican governments like the Śākyakula.[4] Garden parties were held in parks which were, as already observed, the feature of cities in ancient India, and youths of both sexes participated in them. Young princesses also occasionally visited the parks with their maids. The *Kāmadevānuyāna* or *Kāmadevamahotsava* was a festival connected with cupid in which young persons mixed freely with maidens and these were the occasions of many a love marriage.[5] Maidens also participated in the *goṣṭhīs* or social gatherings in which various competitions connected with literature, versification, fine arts, singing, painting, etc. were held; boisterous laughter, humour, merriment and sports were what one met with in these assemblies.[6] *Goṣṭhījanas*, as already indicated, appear to be different from these *goṣṭhīs*. The *Kāmasūtra* mentions also *āpānakas*, i. e. drinking parties, *samājas*, i. e. regular festivals in temples on a fixed day every fortnight when the permanent musicians, dancers, and artistes employed by the temple gave performances of their art in honour of the deity, etc.[7] Fights of an unarmed individual with an elephant, something of the gladiator, are only incidentally referred to;[8] possibly the royalty occasionally enjoyed such a sight. There was also a festival in honour of the sage Agastya which was celebrated on mount Malaya in which the Vidyādharas took part.[9]

CONVEYANCES.

In the Vedic age, horses, bullocks, camels and chariots seem to have been the means of conveyance. No

1 *Bāl*, pp. 12, 55, Act V. 2 *Bāl*, pp. 38-41; *Pañc*, pp. 49-50. 3 Cf. *Pratijñā*, II. 13. 4 Chakladar, *Social Life*, p. 187; Cf. Avi, I. 9—गङ्गः पताकामिव। 5 Cf. *Cār*, pp. 23, 38, 45. 6 Cf. Chakladar, *Social Life*, pp. 164-167. 7 Cf. *Social Life*, pp. 162-163. 8 Cf. the fight of Dāmodara with an elephant in the *Bāl* and that of Avimāraka in the *Avi*. 9 *Avi*, p. 63.

reference is made to the elephant as a means of transport. The region under the Aryan fold was in the Punjab and they were making towards the Gangetic valley in this period.

In the epic period, elephants, horses, camels, chariots and asses were the principal conveyances. Elephants were given the prime place, as they were used by the rich and the royalty, and only important personages rode the elephant. Then came chariots drawn by two or four horses. Camels were the third in importance and lastly came chariots drawn by one horse which were not highly thought of. Asses were used for riding as also for carrying chariots.[1] The *Rāmāyaṇa* also states that asses and mules were largely used in the army.[2] Bulls were the beasts of burden and they carried carts full of load and merchandise. In wars, cars full of arrows which followed charioteers were drawn by bulls.[3]

In the Buddhist period, the chariot was the common conveyance as it was used not only by kings, the rich, and the merchants, but by the commoners also. The chariots were of various designs and were polished. Carriages humbler than chariots and drawn by horses were known as *yānas*, and Ambapālī is said to have obstructed the *yānas* of the Licchavīs who had come to pay their homage to Buddha by putting the wheels of her *yāna* into those of theirs.[4] This also indicates that there were roads wide enough to allow the passage of two carts side by side. Elephants were used for riding and for wars. There are many stories of mad elephants running hither and thither through streets, frightening and endangering the life of citizens. Horses from Sind were famous, but they were also imported. Horses carried chariots, *yānas* and the persons who rode them. Oxen carried carts known as *śakaṭas*. Occasionally cows also were used to draw *śakaṭas*, but Buddha prohibited their employment for that purpose. There were large caravans of bullock carts and they used to travel by night and rest by day. Men used push-carts (*hatthavattaka*). *Śibikā* and palanquins were the conveyances for the sick. Camels are but rarely mentioned. It does not appear that

1 Cf. Vaidya, *Upanishāra*, p. 273. 2 Cf. *ABI*, XIX, p. 181. 3 Cf. Vaidya, *Epic India*, p. 149. 4 Joshi, *Aravinda*, 1921, p. 360.

camels were loaded and used for travelling. Asses were beasts of burden and pulled carts.

Ships were extensively used and were more in vogue than even at present. Commerce was carried on through the Ganges by means of boats. Merchant ships used to go to such distant places as Ceylon, Java and Babylon.

The *Arthaśāstra* speaks in detail with reference to different kinds of roads and enjoins that roads must constantly be kept in repair.[1] Trees were planted along roads and water supply was kept at different stages in the journey. The chariot was the principal vehicle, of which there were seven different sizes and six varieties. *Devaratha* was the chariot for idols; *puṣyaratha* was the festal chariot and *pāriyānika* was ordinarily used for travelling. There were also a number of minor vehicles known as *laghuyāna* (small cart), *goliṅga* (cart drawn by bulls) and *śakaṭa* (big cart). These chariots, carts and other vehicles were usually drawn by camels, bulls or horses. *Śibikā* and *piṭhikā* were varieties of palanquins and they appear to have been ordinarily used by females. Navigation was in an advanced stage of development and was under the control of efficient officers. Water routes consisted of various classes such as ordinary river routes, canal routes, coastal routes and ocean routes. Ships and boats of different shapes were built to answer the requirements of inland and oceanic travel. Sea-going ships were called *sāṁyātirnāvaḥ* and *pravahaṇas*, the latter term being used also to denote chariots. Then there were boats for pearl fishing, river boats, royal barges, ferry boats, private ships, small boats and many other devices for water-carriage prepared from bamboos, baskets, leather, etc.

In our plays, we find mention of elephants, chariots drawn by horses and donkeys, bulls and carriages of different types as the means of conveyance.[2] Donkeys were also used as beasts of burden. They gradually lost public favour and, as has rightly been observed by Dr. Smith, "are now looked upon with contempt and restricted to the humblest services as beasts of burden for potters and washermen".[3] Their use for drawing chariots in common

1 For this paragraph, cf. in general, Law's *Studies in Ancient Hindu Polity*, pp. 68-87. 2 Cf. *Cār*, p. 70; *Pārt*, p. 32—जवातिप्रयुक्तेन खरयोगेन। 3 *EHI* 4th Edition, p. 141.

with the Buddhist and the Mauryan age points to a proximate period for our poet. There were different carriages for different occasions. Gentlemen used covered cars. *Pravahaṇas* were used for the procession of the bridegroom as also for high class ladies and prostitutes; they had cushions within them. *Śibikās* or palanquins borne by servants were for the use of princesses royal. *Vadhūyānas* were the carriages used for marriage ceremonies and the *puṣyaratha* was requisitioned for pompous royal procession on the occasion of Coronation. Horses used to be ridden for long journeys.[1] Bullocks also used to draw carts and they were used as beasts of burden.[2] No mention is made of camels nor of roads, their condition, etc. There are also no particulars given about maritime trade and navigation. Ships are mentioned only in some similes.

POPULAR BELIEFS AND SUPERSTITIONS.

Belief in magic, amulets, omens, etc., is found among the Vedic Indians also, in common with all the ancient people of the world. Amulets are to be seen among the finds at Mohenjo-Daro also.

We have already referred to the belief in magic of the people of the period of our plays. People believed that through the power of magic one could disappear, or assume various forms or change one's countenance, or produce water from the mountains, etc. Kauṭilya has mentioned devices enabling persons to cause sleep, blindness or delusion to others, to be invisible, to open doors, etc.[3] Avimāraka in the *Avimāraka* and Sajjalaka in the *Cārudatta* achieved their objects through practising the precepts of ancient writers on such sciences.[4] There was belief in the infallibility and certainty of the curses pronounced by sages, and even kings tried to bring the fulfilment of the curses.[5] Curse sometimes was believed to assume human form.[6] Not only curses, but hints and advice of revered sages were implicitly obeyed and their propriety, wisdom or religiosity was not questioned.[7] Amulets were prepared to ward off danger.[8] It was

1 Cf. Vatsarāja in *Pratijñā* Act I. 2 *Cār*, pp. 32, 70. 3 *Arthaśāstra*, Adhikaraṇa XIV in general. 4 *Avi*, p. 46; *Cār*, pp. 74-77. 5 Cf. Sauvīrarāja in the *Avi*, and Kaikeyī in the *Prat*. 6 *Bāl*, pp. 22-23. 7 *Avi*, pp. 103, 107—निष्पतितवचनदुर्विचक्षणम् (p. 103); पडिग्गहिदं इसिवअणं (p. 107). 8 *Pratijñā*, pp. 4, 16—'प्रतिसरा'।

believed that human life could be saved in a great fire through divine help.[1] There was a general faith in astrology, and learned ministers such as Yaugandharāyaṇa based their plans on the predictions made by royal astrologers. The course of events ordained by fate was thought to be unchangeable. It was sure to happen. There was belief in the assuming of human forms by the various weapons of God Kṛṣṇa and Goddess Kārtyāyanī. Rākṣasa, Piśāca and Cāṇḍāla women also appear in human forms in the *Bālacarita*. People also believed in the voice from heaven and had implicit faith in that pronouncement.[2] God Agni is said to have granted the favour of a son to queen Sudarśanā of Kāśirāja and again to have saved that son from burning though he entered the forest-conflagration with the intention of committing suicide.[3] Dreams and omens were interpreted by royal astrologers and their directions were followed.[4] The performance of *śānti* and feeding the Brāhmaṇas were believed to ward away ill omens and to bring prosperity. The sound of a crow sitting on a dry tree facing the sun was taken to bring disaster.[5]

TRADE AND INDUSTRY.

The *Ṛgveda* being a collection of hymns to gods, allusions to trade and commerce are naturally rare; yet there are some passages which throw a curious light on the manners of the times. Loans and usury were properly understood in those days and there are references to the lamentable state of indebtedness. Ancestral debts were acknowledged and were required to be paid by descendants. The fixity and finality of the sale transaction is indicated in *Ṛgveda* IV. 24. 9. Contracts were made at the time of sale and purchase, and the terms could not be violated afterwards. There are also distinct allusions to sea voyages, and the avaricious Paṇis had a vast maritime trade. Inland trade was carried by caravans consisting of bullocks, pack-horses, camels, dogs and asses. Traders in ancient India charged exhorbitant prices and were highly unpopular. The various industries were still in their infancy. Houses were built, roads made and boats constructed. Weaving, spinning,

1 Cf. *Avi*, IV. 8; p. 60—अग्निः खलु मां न दहति। 2 Cf. *Avi*, II. 5; pp. 21-22. 3 *Avi*, pp. 60, 105. 4 *Bāl*, p. 26. 5 *Pañc*, p. 48.

plaiting and dyeing were practised, and firs, skins and woollen fabrics were turned into garments, blankets and shawls. Carpentry had made considerable progress as would appear from frequent allusions to the construction of carts, chariots, boats and ships. The use of iron, gold, and other metals was well known and references are found to an ironsmith and a goldsmith.[1] The Mohenjo-Dāro people had trade relations with Southern and Eastern India, Sumer, Ur, Kish, and probably Egypt also. Spinning of cotton and wool was very common and dyers' vats show that dyeing was also practised. The remarkable skill of the lapidary's art is evinced by the well-made stone beads of clear and clouded agate, red translucent carnelian, etc. A number of specimens exhibiting the industries of the goldsmith, engraver, shellworker, mason, weaver, etc. are found, showing that the Indus people practised all the arts of the Chalcolithic age.

Coming to the later Vedic age, it will be seen that, being preoccupied with their philosophical speculations, the Aryans did not make much progress in trade and industry. In the epic period, there were corporations and guilds of various trades, and kings used to subsidize many industries. Garments of cotton, silk and wool were manufactured and exported. References are found to very fine cotton and silk fabrics as also to mixed silken and woollen cloths. Dyes were prepared from different herbs and the colours were fast. Greek writers refer to the liking of the Indians for multicoloured garments. Practically all the metals such as gold, silver, zinc, lead, iron, etc were known. Gold used to be gathered from the Himalayas. Workshops of goldsmiths, ironsmiths, ivory workers, manufacturers of weapons and arms are much referred to. Pearls, corals, gold, silver and gems, spices and rice were some of the exports. Horticulture was in an advanced stage and many public parks and gardens with numerous trees, shrubs and flowers are described. Brisk inland trade was carried as before on pack-horses and pack-bulls, and merchants used to travel in caravans for protection from robbers, wild animals etc. There appears to have been an extensive seaborne trade to Java and other places from the references in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[2]

1 Cf. Das, *Rgvedic Culture*, pp. 139, 141, 143, 146, 148–149. 2 Cf. *ABI*, XIX, p. 139.

The *Jātakas* refer to various kinds of trade—foreign and inland, oceanic and riverine, export and import.[1] Inland trade was carried on by carts and caravans. The caravans consisted of a large number of carts, five hundred being the number generally mentioned, which contained various valuable articles of merchandise, water and foodstuffs. Often their way lay through deserts and forest tracks and leaders of gangs of robbers were not uncommon who waylaid them. Trade relations existed with all parts of India and there were trade routes crossing the whole country. Tradesmen residing in Benares travelled to Ujjayinī for trade, and merchants from Videha carried on trade with Kashmir and Gāndhāra. On account of the mention of '*diśākākas*' (direction-giving crows) whose flying towards the land showed the direction of the coast to the navigators, Dr. Fick thinks that the *Jātakas* speak of "navigation along the coast and not navigation in the open sea".[2] He does not accept the view that there was a regular trade between India and Babylon; but the very fact that "probably Indian sailors went to Babylon" shows that they crossed the sea, as the *Jātakas* do not mention any land route to Baveru (Babylon). The *Samudra Banija Jātaka*, the *Suppāraka Jātaka* and many other *Jātakas* tell us about big ships holding any number of passengers from five hundred and sailing on the high seas to some foreign islands.[3] References are also found to the dangers of sea travel. We also read of *āpaṇa* or shops where arrows, carriages and other goods for sale were kept on view. In the bazaars which were situated in the prominent quarters of the city could be had textile fabrics, grain, greengroceries, perfumes and flowers, works of gold and jewellery, and many other commodities. Traders made huge profits, sometimes recovering double or even treble the original price. Prices were not fixed but were to be settled by haggling or by competition. There were organized guilds of hereditary tradesmen and manufacturers; sixteen different guilds of producers are mentioned. These guilds were important institutions in ancient times. They settled internal disputes by arbitration and maintained high standards in production.

1 Cf. Mookerji, *Hindu Civilization*, pp. 302-305. 2 *Social Organization*, p. 269. 3 *Jātaka* Nos. 41, 186, 190, 196, 384, 442, 463, 466, 518, 539.

Their business was conducted in assembly and it was through the guilds that the king summoned people on important occasions. The profession of money-lending was followed, but the rate of interest is not mentioned.

In the Mauryan period, trade and commerce were under the control of the Superintendent of Commerce, whose duties included control over export and import, securing the safety and convenience of the mercantile traffic, looking to the different products and their purchase and sale at suitable places, etc.[1] Prices of commodities were fixed by the state. Traders paid a certain percentage to the state revenue. Foreign merchandise was imported at reduced taxes and foreign merchants enjoyed security and special privileges. There were various superintendents for different industrial departments such as weaving, mining, metallurgy, agriculture. salt, abkari, etc.[2] Some of them, such as salt and liquor breweries were government monopolies, but the other industrial pursuits and manufactories though run by private enterprise were supervised and at times subsidized by the state. Interest on loans was regulated by the state. Mortgages and deposits required witnesses to give them legality.

Our poet does not furnish us with any information regarding internal and foreign trade. Jewellers, goldsmiths, ironsmiths, shampooers, garland-makers, and florists are mentioned among those carrying on trade of some kind or other. Long journeys for purposes of trade in foreign countries, group of merchants travelling together with their articles, merchants missing their way through fear (of robbers or wild animals) may be inferred.[3] The relation between the debtor and the creditor was peculiar in that the latter was the absolute master of the debtor and could even inflict bodily punishment on him. Taking of loans on some security or on mortgage of the moveables was known and interest had to be paid on the principle amount borrowed.[4]

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

As regards weights and measures, there is possibly no reference to weights in these plays. But to give some

1 *Arthaśāstra*, II. 16. pp. 97-99. 2 Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, Adhikarana II. 3 *Cār*, pp. 45, 77, 78—वणिदारओ चोक्खि आअन्तुओ (p. 45); भीदीए उप्पण्णपुत्तो विअ वणिदारओ (p. 78). 4 Cf. *Pratijñā*, pp. 59, 61. 'ṇihatta—pledged' (p. 59); 'mūlaviddhi'—interest on mortgage (p. 61).

idea as to weights current at the period, we shall briefly describe the same in the light of the information supplied by the *Arthaśāstra*.[1] Weights were made of iron or of stone available in Magadha and Mekala, or of substances that would neither contract nor expand under external influences. Seeds of *māṣa* (Phraseolus radiatus) or *guñja* (Abrus precatorious) were the lowest standards of weight. Ten *māṣa* seeds or five *guñja* seeds equalled one *suvarṇa māṣa*; sixteen *survaṇa māṣas* were equal to one *suvarṇa* or *karṣa*; four *karṣas* made one *pala*. Then there was a silver *māṣa* which weighed eighty-eight white mustard seeds; sixteen silver *māṣas* or twenty *śaibya* seeds made one *dharaṇa*. One *dharaṇa* of a diamond was equal to twenty grains of rice. There were ten different balances with levers of different standard lengths and weights and they had one scale-pan on either side. The lever was then marked for different weights beginning with one *karṣa* (i. e. one-fourth *pala*) and ending with one hundred or two hundred *palas*. Cubic measures were made by dry and strong wood in such a way that the conically heaped up portion of the grains outside the mouth of the measure was equal to one-fourth of the quantity of grains measured, or the measure contained the whole amount of grain. Such measures were *droṇa* (two hundred seeds of *māṣa*), *vārī* (sixteen *droṇas*), *kumbha* (twenty *droṇas*) and *vaha* (ten *kumbhas*). Weights and measures were stamped by the superintendent after the due fees were paid.

Atom (*paramāṇu*) was the minimum used in the measures of length, eight atoms forming into one particle (*rathacakravipruṭ*). Beginning with a particle (i. e. eight atoms) there were gradually one *likṣā*, one *yūka*, one *yava* (barley) and one *aṅgula*, each succeeding measure being eight times the previous one. *Aṅgula*, which was ¾ inch, was taken to be equal in length to the middlemost joint of the middle finger of a medium sized man. Further measures were a *dhanurgraha* (four *aṅgulas*), *dhanurmuṣṭi* (eight *aṅgulas*), *vitasti* (twelve *aṅgulas*), *pada* or *śama* or *śala* or *pariraya* (fourteen *aṅgulas*), *aratni* (two *vitastis* or twenty four *aṅgulas*), *hasta* for measuring balances, cubic measures and pasture lands (two *vitastis* plus one *dhanurgraha* i. e. twenty

1 *Arthaśāstra*, II, 19, pp. 108-109.

eight *aṅgulas*), *hasta* for measuring timber forests (fifty four *aṅgulas*), *daṇḍa* or *dhanu* or *nālikā* (ninety-six *aṅgulas*), *dhanu* for measuring roads and fort-walls used by carpenters (one hundred and eight *aṅgulas*), *goruta* (one thousand *dhanus*) and *yojana* (four *gorutas*). It may be stated that Bhāsa has referred to *dhanu*, *krośa* and *yojana* as measures of distance. According to a commentator on the *Arthaśāstra*, a *goruta* (referred to above) means a *krośa*. Thus, in the light of the lengths given by Kauṭilya, one *krośa* will be equal to two thousand yards and one *yojana* to four and a half British miles.

Nālikā was the period of time required for the passing of one *āḍhaka* of water from a pot through an aperture made by a wire of four *māṣas* of gold four *aṅgulas* in length.[1] *Nālikā* was generally taken to be the standard of the measure of time, though *truṭi*, *lava* (two *truṭis*), *nimeśa* (two *lavas*), *kāṣṭhā* (five *nimeṣas*) and *kalā* (thirty *kāṣṭhās*) were the shorter measures, forty *kalās* making one *nālikā*. Two nālikās amounted to one muhūrta and fifteen *muhūrtas* made one day or one night. Fifteen days and nights together made one *pakṣa* (fortnight), two *pakṣas* made one *māsa* (month), two *māsas* made one *ṛtu* (season), three *ṛtus* made one *ayana* (solstice) and two *ayanas* made one *saṁvatsara* (*varṣa* or year). *Nālikā* was equal to twenty four minutes and we have already referred to the daily time-table of the king. Our plays mention *nālikā*, *divasa*, *rātri* and *varṣa*.

NUMISMATICS.[2]

The cow served as a medium of exchange, and payments were made in cows in ancient India in the Vedic age and the practice continued for a long time. The cow was the higher unit of barter while shells, beads, and cowries were the lower units. Gradually gold came into vogue as a means of exchange, gold dust being found washed away on the banks of the Indus in the Vedic age. Dr. Bhandarkar maintains that *niṣka* was used as coined money in the period of the *Ṛgveda*; but there is no sufficient evidence in support of the theory. The

1 *Arthaśāstra*, II. 20, p. 107—सुवर्णमाषकाश्चत्वारश्चतुरङ्गुलमात्राः कुम्भच्छिद्रमाढकम्मासे या नालिका। 2 Chakraborty, *Ancient Indian Numismatics*, pp. 16-36; Brown, *Coins of India*, pp. 13-21.

reasonable view appears to be that *niṣka* was only a necklace in the *Ṛgveda*, and then it was employed as a means of exchange. It was at a still later period that it gave place to coined money, its value being equal to the metallic weight of the material. Gold, silver, copper and iron were known to the Vedic Aryans, and whereas thousands of *Purāṇas* or *Dharaṇas* or the so-called punch-marked coins have been unearthed in other metals, the fact that no ancient gold coin such as *suvarṇa*, *niṣka* or *pala* has been found in India shows that in the period of the *Ṛgveda* only circular or rectangular ingots of gold were used, and gold had not yet emerged as coined money. That the coinage in India evolved as an indigenous system has been conclusively proved by well-known numismatists. Pāṇini and the *Jātakas* testify to the existence of silver and copper coins in ancient India whose existence is proved to go back at least to 1000 B. C. They are rectangular or circular flat pieces of alloyed silver or copper cut from sheets and clipped to standard weights. On the obverse were impressed various symbols by punch marks (which caused them to be called the punch-marked coins); in the oldest coins the reverse was blank, but later coins contained one, two or three punch-marks. Various kinds of devices such as human figures, arms, animals, birds, and solar, Śaiva and planetary signs were used on the coins.

Paucity of silver in ancient India is evident in the Mohenjo-Dāro finds also, and no definite information is available as to the coinage in the period of the Indus culture. The *Jātakas* mention *suvarṇa*, *purāṇa*, *kākini* and *kārṣāpaṇa* as the coins of the pre-Buddhist and Buddhist period. Though *kārṣāpaṇa* in the Buddhist literature represented a copper coin, some *Smṛti* works refer to it as a silver coin. *Karṣa* was the term more properly applied to the silver coins. The long-cherished view of the numismatists that "the punch-marked coinage was a *private coinage* issued by guilds and silversmiths with the permission of the ruling power" and that the obverse marks were struck by private persons and the reverse punches signified the royal approval, was first questioned by Dr. Spooner, and the researches of Mr. Walsh and Mr. Durgaprasad have finally and conclusively proved that the punched coins constituted a regular *public*

coinage.[1] We have already referred to the coins struck in the Mauryan coinage in accordance with the rules laid down in the *Arthaśāstra*. The crescent-on-the-hill is the royal Mauryan mark which is invariably found on these coins. The public coinage in India goes back to the pre-Mauryan period, cast coins of Avanti of Dharmapāla and of Upagoḍa testifying to the existence of cast coins some centuries before the Mauryas.[2]

It would be beyond the scope of our present study to refer to the elaborate rules given in the *Arthaśāstra* with regard to the superintendent of mint (*lakṣaṇādhyakṣa*), examiner of coins (*rūpadarśaka*), the proportion of different metals, manufacture of coins, different premia for manufacturing, testing and stamping the coins, detection of spurious coins and heavy punishments for the counterfeiters, etc.[3] We may mention that *suvarṇa*, and perhaps *māṣa*, were the names of gold coins; *dharaṇa*, *paṇa*, half *paṇa*, quarter *paṇa*, and one-eighth *paṇa* were the silver coins; and *māṣa*, half *māṣa*, *kākaṇī* and half *kākaṇī* were the copper coins.[4] The exact weight of a *paṇa* is not given by Kauṭilya, but it possibly corresponded with the present rupee. The word *nāṇaka* which is applied to coins in classical Sanskrit literature is not found in Kauṭilya and (as already observed) in Bhāsa.

Bhāsa does not mention any coin by name but uses the generic term *suvarṇa* and *māṣa*, the former of which signified gold coins of a particular weight;[5] *māṣa*, as we know from the *Arthaśāstra*, was applicable to coins of gold or copper weighing one *māṣa*.

SLAVERY.

Curiously enough, slavery which was prevalent in nearly all the other parts of the world in ancient times has been conspicuous by its absence since the olden times in India. There was, however, a class of persons not completely free who were known as the *dāsas*. Now, *dāsa* is a variant of the word *dasyu*, and *dasyus* were the non-Aryan enemies of the Aryans with whom the latter

---

1 Jayaswal, Presidential Address at the Numismatic Society of India, 1935, pp. 5–9. 2 Jayaswal, *op. cit.*, pp. 17–18. 3 *Arthaśāstra*, pp. 58, 203 and 212, 84, 202–203, etc. 4 *Arthaśāstra*, pp. 202–203, 84. Cf. "Suvarṇa as described in the *Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra* was a real gold coin". *OC*, IV, Vol. 2. p. 719. 5 *Du*, p. 9; *Car*, pp. 7, 9, 55.

had to wage many an unpleasant battle. *Dāsas* originally consisted of these *dasyu* captives in war, and later on, their progeny also came to be known as *dāsas*. The information given by the *Manusmṛti* with regard to seven different classes of slaves may be taken as representing the true position of the Vedic and post-Vedic period, though the *Manusmṛti* evidently belongs to a much later period. The different kinds enumerated by Manu included "those who are captured in the field during war (*dhvajāhṛta*), those who serve in return for maintenance (*bhaktadāsa*), those that are born in the house (*gṛhaja*), those that are bought (*krita*), those that are received as gifts (*dātrima*), those that are inherited from the father (*paitrika*) and those that are made slaves by way of punishment (*daṇḍadāsa*)".[1] *Dāsas* are mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* also; in addition to the prisoners of war, those that staked their freedom in the game of dice were treated as *dāsas* if they lost the game.

Coming to the period of the *Jātakas*, we find the existence of the institution of *dāsas* and *dāsis* (male and female slaves or servants). Slavery was the consequence of capture, debt, commutation of death sentence, voluntary self-degradation or judicial punishment. Slaves could be free by the will of their master or by the payment of ransom. They could not be admitted into the religious community (*saṅgha*) while continuing as *dāsas*. A slave girl could be bought for a hundred pieces and a Brāhmaṇa begs seven hundred *kahāpanas* which he considers sufficient for buying a female or a male slave. Owing to the complete absence of legal status of slaves, the nature of their work depended on the individual temperament of the master. Some received fair and humane treatment while others were harshly treated. Their duties varied from crushing and winnowing rice, washing the feet of their master, cooking food and making arrangements of dishes, serving dinner and standing behind with a brush helping the master to dress and undress etc., to serving as a store-keeper, treasurer or private secretary, according to the social position of the master and the intellectual capacity of the slaves themselves.[2]

1 *Manu*, VII. 415; Translations as given in *Social Organisation*, pp. 306-307. 2 Fick, *Social Organisation*, pp. 308-310.

The *Arthaśāstra* mentions six kinds of slaves; (1) those voluntarily mortgaging themselves to pay off their debts, fines or court decrees or to tide over family troubles; (2) those mortgaged by their kinsmen; (3) those enslaved for fines or court decrees; (4) captives of war; (5) issues of slaves; and (6) purchased.

A voluntarily mortgaged slave if he attempted escape, one mortgaged by his kinsmen if guilty of escape on two occasions, and either of these slaves if found planning escape to foreign countries, were condemned to permanent slavery. All the other classes of slaves could win their freedom on payment of a reasonable price. Heavy fines were prescribed for those who refused to emancipate their *dāsas* on the latters' offering the ransom money. The offspring of a person selling himself as a slave was Ārya. After paying the value a slave regained his Āryahood. Kauṭilya forbids the assigning of objectionable works to the slaves as also the exacting of hard labour from them.[1]

It seems rather strange that in face of these numerous references to slaves in ancient India, Megasthenes should emphatically assert that "none of the Indians employ slaves" and that "all Indians are free, and not one of them is a slave".[2] But the statements are not irreconcilable with facts, as the so-called slaves in India were quite distinct from their name-sakes in the West. The master in ancient Rome had power of life and death over his slave and a slave was no better than the chattel of his owner in Roman Law, the penalty for killing a slave being the same as that for killing a four-footed beast. The slave in India, however, was a member of the family of his master. In spite of Dr. Fick's statement, we are inclined to hold that slaves were treated very kindly, thrashing, imprisonment and bad food being found only in exceptional instances.[3] A slave, further, had the protection of the law courts in India and any ill treatment of a slave was visited with severe punishment. According to the *Arthaśāstra* the property of a slave passed not to his master but to his own heirs; the master got it only in the absence of any heir to his slave. The statements of

1 *Arthaśāstra*, III. 13, pp. 181–183. 2 *Cf. Pub. Adm.*, p. 25. 3 *Social Organisation*, p. 310; Contra, Fick himself, *op. cit.* pp. 312–313.

Megasthenes quoted above further indicate the enforcement of the dictum of Kauṭilya that "Never shall an Ārya be subjected to slavery".[1] Should, however, any Ārya be required to undergo slavery, easy rules were framed for his manumission and he not only regained his freedom but his Āryahood as well. Emancipation of slaves was always regarded as a virtuous act which resulted in the institution meeting its natural death in India at an early period, while the evil continued in other civilized societies for a longer time and in a much degraded form.

From our plays, we find that there were male as well as female slaves. They could be purchased from their masters on payment of money; or the masters could set them free on receiving the ransom.[2] Once free from slavery they were included in the Aryan fold.[3] Those, however, that deceived their master were again condemned to servitude.[4] Female slaves after getting their freedom and after getting themselves transferred to Āryahood could use covered carriages like Aryan ladies, and Brāhmaṇa youths could marry them.[5]

---

1 *Arthaśāstra*, III. 13, p. 181—न त्वेवार्यस्य दास्यभावः। 2 *Cār*, pp. 91, 92—जो मे विक्कएण मं वाचेदि (p. 91); दास्यति त्वां निष्क्रयेण (p. 92). 3 *Cār*, p. 102—अय्या सु सि दाणिं संवुत्ता।; Cf. *Arthaśāstra*, III. 13, p. 182—मूल्येन चार्यत्वं गच्छेत्। 4 *Cār*, p. 96—भादु अज्जुअं च पुणो वंचिअ पुणो एव्व दासभावो भवे। 5 Cf. Madanikā in the *Cār* p. 102.

CHAPTER XX.

SOCIAL LIFE (Continued).

PUBLIC VICES.

Gambling, prostitution and theft appear to have been present to some extent in the period of our plays. Ancient people practically all over the globe practised gambling. "Vedic Indian was an inveterate gambler",[1] and *Ṛgveda* X. 34 is the song of a penitent gambler, who by his irresistible attraction to dice, has destroyed the pleasures of his life and his domestic happiness. The uncanny power of the dice is described in forceful terms, and knowing all the ruin, misery and hate they bring, the gambler always falls again into their power. Finally, however, the gambler resolves to turn over a new leaf and after giving up gambling desires to look after his field and family. That the Indus people also had dice and enjoyed gambling would appear plausible from the find of a number of cubes with certain dots which have definitely been identified with dice. Coming next to the epic period, we find that the *Mahābhārata* war was, to a great extent, directly due to the game of dice. The Kṣatriyas were bound by their code of honour not to turn away if invited for gambling. It was considered a cowardice and unbecoming for a Kṣatriya to desist from gambling. The *Śāstras* did not prohibit gambling; but on the contrary, promulgated the dictum that gambling was as sacred as war and that a person should not turn his back from war as well as from gambling if challenged by others.[2] The instances of Yudhiṣṭhira and Nala are well known to every

1 *CHI.* I, p. 98; Basak, *IHQ.* V, p. 310. 2 Cf. आहूतो न निवर्तेत कृतादपि रणादपि ; also *Mahābhārata*, II. 59. 18; II. 76. 20.

reader of the Indian epics. This evil has been enumerated as one of the principal vices of the kings in the epic period. There was a separate gaming hall built in every palace and there were public gaming houses in every city. Manu ordains the king to prohibit gambling and betting, while according to Nārada and Yājñavalkya, the king should protect the game if a fixed portion of revenue be realized from the *sabhika*, who was the license-holder from the king. The *sabhika* used to supervise gambling and was entitled to five percent of the total stakes out of which he paid a fixed portion to the state treasury.[1]

The *Jātakas* show that gambling continued to be popular also in the Buddhist period. The king used to play on a silver board with golden dice. Indebtedness, dissention, deceit, imprisonment, etc. were the necessary results from addiction to gambling, and the sorry plight of the gamblers is often referred to. There were many songs which the gamblers used to chant while casting dice and the peculiar throw is often said to depend on the meaning and bearing of the particular song on the state of affairs at the particular time.[2]

Kauṭilya had placed gambling under a separate officer known as the Superintendent of Gambling who was to centralize gambling in the public gaming house. Those playing outside were to be fined. Dice were supplied by the superintendent on hire and playing by any dice other than those sanctioned by the government was fined. False players not only forfeited their stakes and were fined, but were charged with fines leviable for theft and deceit. The superintendent not forbidding tricks and deceitful practices was liable to double the fine prescribed for deceitful gamblers. The superintendent was entitled to receive not only five percent of the total stakes and the amount of hire for supplying dice and other accessories, but also the fees for providing gamblers with water and accommodation, besides his charge for license. All this went to augment the royal treasury as the superintendent was a paid government servant. Gambling was strictly forbidden in camps.[3]

---

1 Basak, *IHQ.* V, p. 311. 2 Cf. *Jātaka*, Nos. 69, 91, 482. 3 *Arthaśāstra*, III, 20, pp. 197-198; X, 1, p. 364—विवादसौरिकसमाजद्यूतवारणं च कारयेत् ।

In our plays, we find reference to the unwritten law among the gamblers that insults and defeats at the game of dice are to be meekly put up with; the brave looked down upon those not bearing these things.[1] Public gaming halls in big cities and palace buildings are alluded to in different plays. People took to gambling for their maintenance and it was not thought dishonourable for a perfect city-bred gentleman like Cārudatta to lose in dice.[2] Every gambler thought himself in duty bound to pay his debts incurred at the gaming table. The *Mṛcchakaṭika* dilates upon the authority of *sabhika*, the master of the gaming house. He had authority over the body of the debtor; he could inflict any physical punishment, could imprison him or could even sell him.

Allusions in the *Ṛgveda* to the gaily decorated beautiful women decked with ornaments flocking in the festival gatherings do not necessarily lead to the inference of the existence of courtesans in the Vedic age. There were, however, solitary unprotected women who gave themselves up to prostitution, as well as unmarried girls gone astray and married women faithless to their husbands. Pischel and Geldner see many references to hetaerae in some passages of the *Ṛgveda*; but the attempt to prove the existence already at that time of a grand system of courtesans as in Buddha's or Perikles' time must be taken to be unsuccessful as rightly stated by Dr. Winternitz.[3] Gradually there arose an institution of prostitutes; but the princes and the rich alone kept them. We find that in the epic period courtesans received recognition in the court of kings, and many a king had a large retinue of singers and dancers, whose presence was required for state etiquette and by the Indian fondness of pageantry.[4] It is to be noted, however, that these courtesans were quite different from the common prostitutes, and their services were requisitioned on every important auspicious ceremony and on the occasions of festivities by the kings. In the state procession of kings there were many rows of golden palanquins containing these courtesans.

---

1 *Dv*, stanza 11. 2 *Avi*, p. 45; *Cār*, pp. 55, 99—जूदोवजीवी संवुत्तो। तेण जूदे हारिदो। (p. 99). 3 *Rgveda* I, 92. 4; 124. 8: 126. 5, etc. Pischel and Geldner, *Ved. Stud.*, I, pp. XXV, 196, 275, 290, 309; II, 120, 154, 179, etc. Winternitz, *HIL*, I, p. 67; Das, *Rgvedic Culture*, pp. 258–259. 4 Vaidya, *Epic India*, p. 138.

The *Jātakas* also speak of troops of nautch-girls, fair as nymphs of heaven, attached to the royal court, who used to sing, dance, and make music. Sixteen thousand is said to be their general number. There are also allusions to dancing girls, courtesans and fallen women. Their prices were very high,—a thousand pieces per night, and they kept a retinue of five hundred slave girls. Kings and rich persons used to visit these courtesans. Dancing, singing, and drinking were the usual occupations of public women. Kings sometimes deposed courtesans from their position and afterwards restored them.[1]

The superintendent of prostitutes was to determine the earnings, inheritance, income, expenditure and future earnings of every prostitute, and check her expenditure, in the Mauryan period. Prostitutes were to report daily to the superintendent and they could not refuse to yield their person after receiving the requisite amount of fees. Elaborate rules are given about offences by and against prostitutes; a prostitute murdering her paramour was to be sentenced to be burnt alive or thrown into water. Fifteen percent of the earnings (twice the amount of a day's earnings per month) of the prostitutes was to go to the state treasury. Arts to be learnt by the prostitutes included singing, music, dancing, acting, painting, reading, writing, reading the thoughts of others, manufacture of scents and garlands, shampooing, art of attracting and captivating the hearts of others. Their residences were to the south in the city.[2]

In our plays, we come across a cultured courtesan with a sterling character who was proficient in song, music, dance and painting. Courtesans were generally more educated and better skilled in fine arts than married women, and hence gentlemen like Cārudatta and Śarvilaka were attracted to them on account of their exceptional qualities.[3] Courtesans possessing all virtues were not rare. Viṭa, a person associated with the prostitutes, was a cultured man reduced to poverty owing to enjoying his wealth fully.[4] The fact that he speaks Sanskrit shows

---

1 *Jātaka* Nos. 313, 318, 419, 423, 481, 517, 522, 525, 531, 538, 543-545, etc. 2 *Arthaśāstra*, I. 27, pp. 123-125; p. 55—रूपाजीवास्तालावचारा वेश्याश्च दक्षिणां दिशामधिवसेयुः। 3 Cf. Vasantasenā and Madanikā in the *Cār*. 4 Cf—मान्यः कलत्रवान् मुक्तविभवो गुणवान् विटः। *Saraswatikaṇṭhābharaṇa*, V. 170, p. 603.

him to be a well-read man. According to Vātsyāyana, marriage with prostitutes was valid for one year only.[1]

Theft and robbery were ancient evils being found mentioned even in the *Ṛgveda*. As compared with other ancient nations, thefts were rather scarce, uncommon, and few and far between in India. The epics also tell about the absence of theft. We have already referred to the highwaymen and robbers in the Buddhist age. Megasthenes has complimented the Indians on account of very rare occurrence of thefts. It was a matter of great wonder to the Greek ambassador that in the vast army of Candragupta consisting of four lacs of persons there were practically no thefts; and those that occurred pertained not to valuables but to small articles not exceeding two hundred drachmas in value.[2]

The particulars supplied about a thief in the *Mṛcchakaṭika* which, though belonging to a later age, no doubt incorporates ancient traditions, lead us to infer that in olden times thievery was practised as an art.[3] Skanda or Kumāra Kārtikeya was the patron deity of thieves and hence they were also called Skandaputras. Skanda, though the godfather of thieves, was worshipped for the recovery of stolen property. There were other deities such as Kanakaśakti, Bhāskaranandin and Yogācārya (who is said to have been taught by Skanda) whose blessings a thief invoked before proceeding to his work. There were different treatises, schools and teachers of the subject. Kanakaśakti is said to have mentioned four different ways of making holes in walls according as the material used was baked bricks, unbaked bricks, mud or wood; various shapes of holes were prescribed as suited the particular occasion. The student, it appears, passed through some period of apprenticeship after receiving full instructions from his teacher. The teacher presented his favourite pupils with specially useful articles such as a magical ointment (*yogarocanā*) capable of rendering invisible and invincible the person applying it. The thief proceeded on his mission with all the equipments and paraphernalia of his trade including housebreaking implements, a measuring tape (in the absence of which the

1 Chakladar, *Social Life*, p. 208. 2 *Indika*, pp. 31-32; Vaidya, *Epic India*, p. 143. 3 *Mrcchakaṭika*, Act III.

sacred thread served the purpose), flies for extinguishing lamps, dummy, magic seeds, etc.

One of the ancient masters of the science of thieving, *viz.* Kharapaṭa, whom one of the characters in our plays pays his homage, is alluded to by Kauṭilya.[1] The study of the *Arthaśāstra* provided thieves with instructions in the matter of causing drowsiness to the inmates of any particular household, or of opening doors or becoming invisible etc., though the *Arthaśāstra* mentions these devices in quite a different connection. Thieves appear to have generally received instructions in the science in the period of our plays, and they began their work with their instruments after bowing to their deities. The thief in the Cār, however, was conscious of the lowness and shame of his business and though he tries to justify it on the precedent of Aśvatthāman, he admits that he is driven to the despicable work owing to the power of cupid. Even thieves had their code of honour aud they desired, like the modern Umāji Naik, to come across greedy, rich and ruthless merchants, and also that no woman should come in their way and that no harm should come through them to an honourable, virtuous and pious person. A thief was conscious of the heinousness of his crime and tried his utmost not to kill or even wound anybody.[2] He was steady in his love and risked even his life and honour for the sake of securing freedom to his beloved.

FAMILY LIFE.

As has rightly been observed by Dr. Banerjea, in contrast to some sociologists who hold that the tribe was the earliest type of social aggregation, the family was the starting point in social evolution.[3] From this basis arose two distinct directions culminating in the state and the individual. The reverence for family ties was firmly established in India from the earliest times. The wife was the mistress of the household, and though polygamy was not unknown, we come across sweet and affectionate relations in the family life of the Vedic age, the family consisting of parents, brothers, sisters, daughters-in-law, etc. The joint family, as is still held under the Hindu

1 *Cār.* p. 75; *Arthaśāstra*, IV. 8, p. 221—"Kharapatta". Cf. also G. H. Sastri, *AMV*, I, pp. 224-227. 2 Cf. *Cār*, III. 7, 8; pp. 76, 94, etc. 3 *Pub. Adm.*, p. 24 and n1.

Law, has been since the ancient times, common in food, worship and residence. The family was held together by the tie of natural affection, all acquisitions were joint property and all expenses were met from the common funds. The father was the head and protector of the family having numerous obligations to the rest of the family who owed their duties to the father. The father had no powers of life and death over the members as enjoyed by the Roman *pater familias*, and each individual member had a *locus standi* in the law courts. The father was then, as even now, only the manager, the representative of the family. The same state of affairs in the joint family normally continued down to the middle of the nineteenth century A. D., when the western education gradually began to prejudice the minds of the young against their time-honoured institution and obscured their true judgment by the dazzling of the so-called modernism with the result that the joint family is rather a rarity at present.

The epics provide us with pictures of affectionate and amicable joint-family life. In the Buddhist age also, we read of families consisting of father, mother, son, daughter-in-law, etc., but the jealousies of the co-wives show that peace did not prevail in the family. Disparaging remarks about women, as already observed, need not be taken at their face value and hence we cannot generalize on the strength of those remarks. The *Arthaśāstra* also speaks of the joint family, stating in addition that with the exception of the sleeping room, all parts of the house were to be commonly shared by all members of the family.[1] Kauṭilya even penalizes a father embracing asceticism without providing for his dependants.

Though no definite statement is made by our poet with regard to a joint family, it appears that married women resided with the parents of their husbands. Looking to the comfort of the father-in-law and the mother-in-law was one of the main duties of a wife.[2] We have already referred at different places to the atmosphere of cordiality, respect and affection prevailing in the family, and the ideals of the relationship between husband and wife (*Svapna*, *Pratimā*), between father and son (*Pratimā*), and between brothers (*Pratimā*). It would seem that

1 *Arthaśāstra*, III. 8, p. 167. 2 Cf. *Prat*, p. 33; *Pratijñā*, p. 9.

some persons resided in the house of their wives with their mother-in-law and father-in-law.[1]

FORMS OF GREETING.

As has rightly been observed by the late MM. Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri, किमास्से (lit. Are you seated?) "Howdido?" seems to be the usual form of greeting employed in these plays.[2] A person greeted another by words like किमास्से or किमास्यते (*Prat.* p. 16) or simply आस्यते (*Bāl*, p. 28). The form सुखमास्ते ते जननी (*Pañc*, p. 84) is also a variant of किमास्से. The person greeted usually replied with the words आस्यताम् 'Pray, be seated' (*Dv*, p. 14; *Prat*, p. 17; *Bāl*, p. 28). This mode of greeting seems to have generally been employed in the case of equals or from the elder to a younger person. Wives greeted their husbands with the expression जेदु अज्जउत्तो or जेदु महाराओ "Victory to my lord" (*Svapna*, pp. 88, 125; *Avi*, p. 3; *Prat*, p. 16; जेदु महासेणो *Pratijñā*, pp. 51, 55), to which the latter replied with आस्यताम् (*Svapna*, pp. 89, 125; *Prat*, pp. 16-17; *Pratijñā*, pp. 51, 55; एदुपविस *Avi*, p. 3); and the final जं अज्जउत्तो (or महाराओ) आणवेदी from their wives ended the formal greetings after which the general conversation began.

An alternative formula generally employed between equals or from elders was couched in words like अपि कुशली भवान् 'Are you well?' (*Abhi*, p. 50; *Pañc*, p. 84; *Dv*, p. 15—सर्वे सभृत्याः कुशलोपपन्नाः।) and the reply to the greeting was अद्य कुशली संवृत्तोऽस्मि 'I am well indeed today'. The form of greeting to cowherds included inquiry about the well-being of the cows, which preceded that for the health of the family:

वसुदेवः—वयस्य नन्दगोप! अपि भगवतीभ्यो गोभ्यः कुशलम्।
नन्दगोपः—आम भट्टा! कुषलं।
वसुदेवः—अथ भवतः परिजनस्य कुशलम्।
नन्दगोपः—आम भट्टा! कुषलं। (*Bāl*, p. 11)

Intimate friends or near relations on very cordial terms, such as brothers or brothers-in-law, used to do away with formal greetings and embraced each other with

1 Cf. Gārgasevaka in *Pratijñā*, p. 57. 2 *Dv*, p. 14, Com.—कुशलप्रश्नमुद्राचार ईदृशो भासनाटकेषूपलभ्यते। It may be noted that this similarity of forms also constitutes a factor in favour of assigning common authorship to these plays. We are indebted to the late Dr. Winternitz for suggesting this topic for inclusion in our book.

affection. Thus Duryodhana after the conclusion of sacrifice pays his respects to the elders but desires to clasp his friend Karṇa (*Pañc*, p. 21 and com.), Rāma and the eldest Brāhmaṇa boy ask their younger brothers to embrace them (*Prat*, pp. 85, 128; *Mv*, p. 17), and king Duryodhana requests his friend and brother-in-law king Sugṛhīta to do him the same favour (*Avi*, p. 94).

The usual form of paying respects in the case of youngsters was to make their obeisances with the expression मोस्तात (or आचार्य or आर्य or भगवन् as the case may be) अभिवादये and receive the blessings from their elders wishing them long life or extraordinary valour, renown, victory or Brahmaloka (एद्येहि पुत्र। ब्रह्मलोकमवाप्नुहि। or चिरंजीव। or अतिबलपराक्रमो भव। or पितृसदृशगुणकीर्तिर्भव। or आयुष्मान् भव।) to which the final reply of the youngsters was अनुगृहीतोऽस्मि 'I thank you (lit. I am honoured)' which terminated the greeting affair.[1] In some cases the form of blessing was simply स्वस्ति or स्वस्ति भवते "Peace or prosperity to you".[2] The persons saluting Dhṛtarāṣṭra appear to announce their name purposely as the king was blind.[3] The practice of blessing and wishing long life to the persons saluting was so common, that absence of any blessing was regarded as rather inauspicious; even a differently worded blessing which purposely omitted the wish for long life slightly unnerves Karṇa in the beginning, though somehow he consoles himself.[4] The Prakrit form of salutation appears to be मत्रवं (or अय्ये or मादुल) वन्दामि which was used by ladies and persons speaking Prakrit. After receiving suitable blessings the person responded as above with अणुग्गहीदम्हि "I thank you".[5]

Ascetics were usually greeted with inquiries as to all being well with their penance in words like अपि तपस्विनां तपो वर्धते।[6] It may be recalled that Kālidāsa has also used a similar form in the Śākuntala.

Servants saluted their masters or princesses with the respectful words जयतु महाराजः or जेदु भट्टा or जेदु भट्टिदारिका "Victory to your honour".[7] An alternative form was अपि सुखमार्यस्य "Is all well with your honour?" or सुहं अय्यस्स

1 *Pañc*, pp. 20-21; 95, 96, 119; *Bāl*, pp. 64-65; *Prat*, pp. 80-81, 84; *MV*, pp. 16-17, 40, 41. 2 *Pañc*, pp. 57, 74, 91; *Prat*, p. 85; *Avi*, pp. 100, 108-109. 3 *Dgh*, pp. 57, 64. 4 *Dgh*, p. 57, st. 15; *Karṇa*, pp. 78-79. 5 *Svapna*, pp. 16, 36-37; *Bāl*, pp. 35, 39; *Pañc*, pp. 49, 74. 6 *Prat*, pp. 47, 95. 7 *Abh*, p. 59; *Avi*, pp. 28, 24; *Pratijñā*, pp. 11, 13; *Bāl*, p. 11.

"Your honour's health" as used by Prakrit speaking persons.[1] The particular form recommended for a chariot driver in the case of his master was जयावायुष्मान् ।[2]

PLANTS AND FLOWERS.[3]

There is a well-known convention among Sanskrit poets that some particular trees put forth blossoms or flowers at the touch, look, talk, dance or kicks etc. of young women :

पादाघातादशोकस्तिलककुरबकौ वीक्षणालिङ्गनाभ्यां
स्त्रीणां स्पर्शात्प्रियङ्गुर्विकसति बकुलः सीधुगण्डूषसेकात् ।
मन्दारो नर्मवाक्यात् पटुमृदुहसनाच्चम्पको वक्त्रवाता-
च्चूतो गीतान्नमेरुर्विकसति च पुरो नर्तनात्कर्णिकारः ॥

Among the trees mentioned by our poet *Aśoka* is said to put forth flowers when struck by ladies with decked foot; *Bakula* is believed to blossom when sprinkled by young women with mouthfuls of wine; *Priyaṅgu* is said to put forth blossoms at the touch of women, *Campaka* is said to flower at the soft captivating smile of young maidens and *Cūta* or mango is said to blossom at the song of women. The poets believe that *Kadamba* puts forth buds at the roaring of clouds.

Ten different words have been used by Bhāsa for various kinds of lotuses and water-lilies. *Kokanada* is red lotus, while *Aravinda* is either red or blue. The terms *Kuvalaya* and *Utpala* (also *Asitotpala* and *Nilotpala*) signify blue or white lotus or any water-lily. *Kumuda* is white or red lotus and it is said to open at moon rise. *Kamala*, *Śatapatra*, *Padma*, and *Aravinda* are the generic names for lotus; the last word also denotes Sun lotus or red or blue lotus.

Bakula, *Sarala*, *Sarja*, *Arjuna*, *Kadamba*, *Nīpa* and *Nicula* are mentioned as fragrant flowers and the favourites of the rainy season.[4] *Bakula* is Mimusops Elengi, an evergreen tree with smooth scaly bark. It has got white fragrant flowers which are used for making garlands; a perfume is also distilled from them. Oil is

1 *Abh*, p. 59; *Pratijñā*, pp. 11, 13; *Avi*, pp. 23, 24. 2 *Pañc*, pp. 61, 62, 110. 3 The information about plants and flowers has been gathered from "*The Commoner flowering plants of Western India*" by M. Isaacs and from the footnotes in Dr. Woolner and Sarup's *Thirteen Trivandrum plays*. It has been supplemented by our own observations. 4 *Avi*, p. 75.

obtained from the seeds, and the flowers, fruit and bark are strongly astringent. *Sarala* is Pinus Longifolia, a tree with slender branches, forming a round top-head. Its branchlets are light yellow-brown and the flowers are monoecious. *Sarja* is the *Sāla* tree, Vatica Robusta, which is very tall and stately. *Arjuna* is Terminalia which is known in Marathi as Arjuna Sadada. *Kadamba*, also known as Kalam or Kadam, is Mitragyna Parvifolia, and has greenish yellow fragrant flowers. The wood is hard and compact and is used for buildings. *Nipa* is a variety of Kadamba; known as Kadam or Niv, it has orange coloured fragrant flowers. The fresh juice of the bark is used in the inflammation of the eye. *Nicula* is Barringtonia Acutangula, known in vernacular as Dhātriphala, Tivar or Ingli. It is a tree having sweet-scented dark scarlet flowers. Its fruit rubbed in water is used as an emetic. The other trees mentioned by Bhāsa are *Aguru*, *Āmra*, *Asana*, *Aśoka*, *Kapittha*, *Lodhra*, *Madhūka*, *Nimbu*, *Nyagrodha*, *Pārijātaka* and *Saptaparṇa*. *Aguru* is the fragrant aloewood and tree: Acquiluria Agallocha. *Āmra*, as is well known, is the mango tree, Magnefera Indica Its fruit is eaten largely as well as made into pickles, preserves, etc. *Asana* is Terminalia Tomemtosa, known in vernacular as Ain, Asna or Saga. The wood is used for building, etc. and as fuel. The bark is used for tanning. Reference has already been made to the poetic convention about *Aśoka*—Jonesia Asoka Roxb, a tree having red flowers. *Kapittha* known as Kavaṭh in Marathi is the wood-apple, Feronia Elephantum. The tree is armed with sharp spines. The unripe fruit in the form of decoction is used in diarrhoea, and the ripe fruit is used for chutneys, jelleys and sherbets. *Lodhra* is the name of a tree with white or red flowers. *Madhūka*, commonly known as Moha, is Bassia Latifolia—a tree with many branches. Its flowers are creamy white with a sweetish taste. They are eaten raw or cooked and afford a nourishing food. A strong spirit called Maurah is distilled from them. *Nimbu* is Citrus Medica Var Acida, a kind of *Jambira* (Lime). It is employed for making lime juice which is used in scurvy and as a cooling drink for allaying thirst. *Nyagrodha* is the Indian Fig tree. *Palāśa* is Butea Frondosa, of which the seeds are used as a vermifuge. The flowers yield a yellow dye and the bark and the root yield good fibre.

The wood is used for boxes, toys, etc. *Pārijātaka* is the name of one of the five trees of the Paradise. It is said to have been produced at the churning of ocean. It was wrested by Kṛṣṇa from the hands of Indra and planted in the garden of Satyabhāmā. The flowers have a pleasing fragrance and are white coloured with red stalk. *Saptacchada* (or *Saptaparṇa*) known as Satvin is Alstonia Scholaris, a tree with bitter milky juice and greenish white flowers. A decoction of the bark is applied to wounds and ulcers and internally the bark is tonic, antiperiodic and alterative, and is used in fevers, dyspepsia, and cutaneous fevers.

Campaka is a tree known as Michelia Champaka bearing yellow fragrant flowers which are prized for their sweet scent. *Kanakacampaka* is a variety of Campaka with gold coloured flowers. *Japāpuṣpa* is China Rose with red fragrant flowers. *Mallikā* is a kind of Jasmine having white flowers.

Kāśa, *Kuśa*, and *Dūrvā* are different kinds of grass. *Kāśa* is used for mats, roofs, etc., and its flower is known as Moringa flower. *Dūrvā* is bent grass and is a sacred article of worship to deities. Śara is a kind of white reed or grass and *Vaṁśa* is a bamboo.

Bandhujīva, *Cāṅgerikā*, *Kadalī*, *Mādhavī*, *Priyaṅgu* and *Śephālikā* are the different plants and herbs mentioned by Bhāsa. *Bandhujīva* known as Dupārī is Pentapetes Phoenicea, an erect branched herb with red flowers. *Cāṅgerikā* is Rumex Vesicarius, the vernacular name being Cukā. It is an erect annual glabrous herb, grown as a vegetable. The leaves, seeds and roots are used medicinally. *Kadalī* is the plantain tree. *Mādhavī* is Gaertnera Racemosa, a spring creeper with white fragrant flowers. *Priyaṅgu* which, as already stated, is said to put forth blossom at the touch of women, is Capparis Zeylanica; its fruit is eaten by the Hindus on certain auspicious days. *Śephālikā* is a kind of plant known as Seoli (Nyctanthes Arbor Tristis) with a white and orange flower which falls in the morning. The blossoms have orange stems which have been compared to Puttees the colour of red arsenic.[1] All these plants and flowers, as

1 *Svapna*, p.64—अद्यमणसिलावट्टपिंडं विअ सेहालिआकुसुमेहिं।

they show no particular provenance but grow all over India, do not help us in fixing the locality of the poet.

HONOUR TO ELDERS.

As would appear from the forms of greeting in the case of elders, the elders were always respected by the youngsters by making their obeisance to them. Venerable persons like the sage Nārada or the Lord Nārāyaṇa were treated in addition with *arghya* and *pādya* (i. e. their feet were washed and they were worshipped).[1] It was customary for the elders, as already noted, to pronounce blessings wishing long life to those paying homage to them; the absence of any blessing coming from the elder was regarded as an ill omen and a differently worded blessing not particularly referring to long life was a matter of surprise to one receiving the blessing.[2] Karṇa, however, prefers on second thought the blessing wishing him everlasting fame to that wishing him long life. Not only was the presence of the elders adored by according them respectable treatment, but the mere mention of the name of a revered or divine person was honoured by the listener by getting up from his seat. Thus Dhṛtarāṣṭra rises with folded arms at the mention of Nārāyaṇa; Udayana gets up from his seat when the chamberlain begins to deliver the message of Mahāsena; King Virāṭa when told of Bhīṣma coming with the Kuru forces for the cattle-raid, rises and folds his hands in obeisance to the great personage, which wins admiration from Yudhiṣṭhira (in disguise) who remarks that the king though insulted did not transgress the rules of etiquette.[3]

FUNERARY CUSTOMS.

Cremation seems to be the custom for the disposal of the dead in the Vedic age as would appear from the funeral hymns, *Ṛgveda*, X, 15. 18. Dr. Winternitz, however, sees in *Ṛgveda*, X. 18. 10-13, a reference to the burial of the corpse; but as explained by Sāyaṇa, the hymns refer to urn-burial, i. e., burial of the urn containing ashes of the corpse.[4] It is in the later Vedic literature, the *Atharvaveda* and the different *Brāhmaṇas* that we

---

1 *Dc*, p. 30; *Avi*, p. 100. 2 Cf. *Dgh*, p. 57, st. 15; *Karṇa*, pp. 78-79.
3 *Dgh*, p. 65; *Svapna*, p. 129; *Pañc*, p. 60. 4 *HIL*, I, p. 96; Contra, Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 571; Chanda, *MASI*, 31, p. 9.

find references to the different modes of burial, and later on the *Gṛhyasūtras* prescribe an elaborate ritual.[1] This later phase was perhaps due to the fusion with the concepts of some alien elements in the Aryan population. At Mohenjo-Dāro and Harappa three forms of burial in disposing of the dead have been noticed. Complete burials consisted of the burial of the whole body ceremonially performed, along with the so-called grave furniture, offerings, etc.; in fractional burials, some bones of the body were collected after its exposure to wild beasts and birds and were buried in urns along with a number of earthenware vessels and other small objects; and post-cremation burials were to be found in large wide-mouthed urns containing a number of smaller vessels, bones of animals and birds, a variety of small objects, charcoal and ashes.[2] Cremation seems to be the usual method of the disposal of the dead in the epic age. It appears that the bodies of those dead on the battle-field were not duly disposed of but were left over there uncared for at the mercy of vultures, jackals, etc. The *Mahābhārata* states that the death of a person in war is not to be mourned, nor are any funeral oblations to be made to him, nor should a purificatory bath taken on his account; he is said to get a very high place in heaven.[3] In the Buddhist age, dead bodies were cremated and stupas were built over the ground. The bodies of criminals and the indigent were thrown away to rot in the *Sivathikā Smaśāna* where vultures and jackals fed on them. We also read of the *Āmaka Smaśāna*, "cemetery of raw flesh" in the *Jātakas*. Strabo records that round about Taxila there existed a custom of throwing a dead body to be devoured by vultures.[4]

From our plays we get an indication that cremation was current in those days from the reference to the placing of the dead body on the funeral pyre.[5] It would, of course, be a bold assertion to assume that the dead bodies of children were abandoned outside the cities; the custom

---

1 Venkateswara, *AP*, 1930, p. 19; Chanda, *MASI*, 31, pp. 8-12. 2 *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization* and other articles. 3 Cf. *Mahābhārata*, XII. 98. 45:

अशोच्यो हि हतः शूरः स्वर्गलोके महीयते।
न चास्य नोदकं तस्य न श्राद्धं नाप्यशौचकम्॥

4 *Ancient India, Strabo*, by Macrindle, p. 69. 5 *Dph*, st. 9. चिताँ न तावत्स्वयमस्य देहमारोपयन्त्यङ्गुलदर्शनाभ्याम्।

does not, however, appear to be merely local, or pertaining only to herdsmen, as it is said to be the way of the world.[1] The reference in the *Bālacarita* (p. 65) to the throwing out of the corpses (अपविध्यतां कलेवराणि) of Kaṁsa, Cāṇūra and Muṣṭika need not necessarily be taken as referring to the general custom, because the three persons were treated as the enemies of Viṣṇu; and further we do not know whether the corpses were merely to be abandoned or were to be cremated according to the usual custom.

WRITING.

No one now seriously controverts the proposition that writing has been in use in India since very ancient times. There is a difference of opinion as to the prevalence of writing in the age of the *Ṛgveda*, some scholars holding that it was known in that age. Whatever be the legends on the pictographs on the Indus seals, that they represent the art of writing in its infancy is indisputed. So there should be no difficulty in accepting that writing prevailed to a great extent in the Buddhist age, and the period represented by the *Arthaśāstra* and our plays. The *Arthaśāstra* mentions *Tālī*, *Tāla* and *Bhūrja* as yielding leaves which were used as writing material.[2] Rājaśekhara has referred to *Tālipatra* as being current in the North, whereas *Tālapatra* was used in the South. Bhāsa's use of the word *Tālipatta* in the *Cārudatta* has been taken as referring to the same as a writing material, and on Rājaśekhara's testimony, Bhāsa has been taken to be a northerner.[3] But Bhāsa has employed the term *Tālipatta* as meaning an ornament for the ear. Possibly, the preference shown to the word *Tālipatta* may show Bhāsa to have hailed from the North, especially as there is nothing in his plays to contradict the assumption of his being a northerner.

PURIFICATION.

Sufficient reference has already been made to the use of water for removing various sorts of physical impurities, such as tears etc. as also for the purposes of purification or sanctifying a vow, etc. No one entered the house without washing feet.[4] Among the numerous

1 *Bāl*, p. 12—काष्ठभूतं कलेवरं त्यज्यताम् ।...ईदृशो शोकधर्मः । त्यज्यताम् । 2 *Arthaśāstra*, II. 17, p. 100. 3 *Cār*, p. 82; *Svapnavā Sundari*, p. 14. 4 Cf. *Cār*, p. 68.

methods of purification, two methods suggested in the *Bālacarita* are (1) by a plunge bath and (2) by the application of dust from the earth. A plunge bath was the usual method while the cowherds preferred the latter method. Prof. Pisharoti suggests that the dust of cowdung or dust from the footprints of a cow was particularly desirable.[1]

SUICIDE.

Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* is bitter against those committing suicide. It enjoins that none was to perform cremation rites or funeral obsequies to those ending their lives voluntarily.[2] In some cases, however, entering fire or water with the aim of ending one's life was not condemned if the act was committed by one tired with life or suffering from some incurable disease or with some higher aim in view. The ancient Indian used to end his life by some such means when the world had no charm for him, or his life was spoiled by sin and sorrow. King Udayana Vatsarāja, being grieved at the death of his father-in-law, is said to have departed from this world along with his queens by ascending the top of a hill and falling from the precipice.[3] Kumārila also ended his life by entering the funeral pyre. Our poet evidently had Udayana's method in view and he indicated that with approval when out of the several modes of killing oneself he prefers that by throwing oneself down from the precipice to that by entering fire.[4] Ending one's life by drowning is condemned as being ignoble.[5] It may be recalled that in the sacrifice called *Sarvasvāra* the person desirous of obtaining heaven entered fire after *ārbhavastotra*, and the *Ṛtviks* completed the *yāga* thereafter. King Śūdraka is said to have similarly ended his life. Japanese admirals and others greatly devoted to the king commit harakiri (suicide) in grief after his death.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

From the social conditions existing in the period of Bhāsa described herein before, it will be found that on the whole a high tone of morality prevailed in those days and the people lived almost a simple, straightforward life.

1 *QJMS*, XXV, p. 232n 10. 2 *Arthaśāstra*, IV, 7, p. 219. 3 Pradhan, *Chronology of India*, p. 246. 4 *Avi*, p 60—मरणप्राप्तो हि सर्वार्थसाधकः। 5 *Avi*, p. 59.

Some further facts strengthening this view are briefly stated here.

Every body valued his or her words so that it was thought unbecoming to cancel one's words after announcing a particular thing.[1] The deposit of articles was scrupulously preserved even in the absence of witnesses, and Cārudatta, though expressly advised by his friend Maitreya, cannot think of denying the deposit although it was not strictly proveable legally. It was considered improper to hear the secrets of others.[2] The fact that a high moral standard of conduct was ingrained in the minds of all would appear from the remarks of Avimāraka expressing that he was rather ashamed to face his elders, though he had married princess Kurangī in the Gāndharva form, as his marriage was not in the strictly approved highest form.[3]

---

1 Cf. *Svapna*, p. 21—पढमं उग्गीलिअ को किं इच्छदि त्ति अज्जुत्तं दाणिं विआरिदुं।
2 *Cār*, p. 92—अज्जुत्तं पररहस्सं सोदुं। 3 *Avi*, p. 107—अनिच्छत इवात्मनेन वृत्तान्तेन।

APPENDIX I.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

(A)

BHĀSA'S PLAYS: TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS.

Abhiṣekanāṭaka. Ed. by T. Ganapati Sastri. TSS, No. 26. Trivandrum, 1913.

Abhiṣekanāṭaka. Ed. with Intr. & Com. by V. Venkataram Sastri. Lahore, 1930.

Abhiṣekanāṭaka. Eng. Trans. with Notes by K. Rama Pisharoti. *AUJ*, IV, pp. 133-148 ; 277-286 ; V, pp. 121-134 ; 245-253.

Avimārakam. Ed. by T. Ganapati Sastri. TSS No. 20. Trivandrum, 1912.

Avimārakam. Eng. Transl. with notes by K. Rama Pisharoti. *Shama'a*, IV, pp. 285-295 ; V, pp. 47-59 ; 114-126 ; 270-284.

Avimārakam. Malayalam Trans. by K. Narayanan Poti with Intr. in English by K. G. Sesha Iyer. Trivandrum, 1924.

Avimāraka. Marathi Trans. by V. D. Deshpande. Dhulia, 1926.

Awimāraka. Übersetzt von H. Weller. Leipzig, 1924.

Ūrubhaṅga. Ed. By T. Ganapati Sastri. TSS. No. 22. Trivandrum, 1912.

Ūrubhaṅga. Eng. Trans. with Notes by K. Rama Pisharoti. Maharajah's College Magazine, Ernakulam.

Ūrubhaṅga. Ed. with Intr. Notes and Eng. Trans. by K. N. Bhatnagar, Lahore.

Ūrubhaṅga. Eine Indische Tragodie ? Übersetzt von H. Weller, Stuttgart, 1933.

Karṇabhāra. Ed. by T. Ganapati Sastri. TSS No. 22. Trivandrum, 1912.

Karṇabhāra (Text). *Mañjūṣā*, II, pp. 41-49.

Karṇabhāra. Eng. Transl. with Notes by K. Rama Pisharoti, Maharajah's College Magazine, Ernakulam.

Cārudatta. Ed. by T. Ganapati Sastri, TSS No. 39. Trivandrum, 1914.

Cārudatta. Ed. with Com. by T. Ganapati Sastri. Trivandrum, 1922.

Dūtaghaṭotkaca. Ed. by T. Ganapati Sastri. TSS. No. 22. Trivandrum, 1912.

Dūtaghaṭotkaca. Eng. Transl. with Notes by K. Rama Pisharoti. *Shama'a*, IV, pp. 129-151.

Dūtavākya. Ed. by T. Ganapati Sastri. TSS No. 22. Trivandrum, 1912.

Dūtavākya. Ed. with Com. by T. Ganapati Sastri. 2nd and 3rd Edn. Trivandrum, 1918, 1925.

Dūtavākya. Eng. Trans. with Notes by K. Rama Pisharoti. *People's Friend*, Trivandrum.

Dūtavakya. (or Envoy's Declaration). Eng. Trans. by Dharmasila Jayaswal. *MR*. Dec. 1925, pp. 665-669.

Dūtavākya (or the Mission of Śrī Kṛṣṇa). Eng. Trans. by H. L. Hariyappa. Bangalore, 1932.

Pañcarātra. Ed. by T. Ganapati Sastri. TSS No. 17. Trivandrum, 1912.

Pañcarātra. Ed. with Com. by T. Ganapati Sastri. Trivandrum, 1917.

Pañcarātra. Ed. with Eng. Trans. and Notes by S. M. Paranjape. Poona, 1917.

Pañcarātra. Ed. with Skt. Com. by Kṛṣṇācārya and Intr., Eng. Trans, & Notes by W. G. Urdhwareshe. Indore, 1920.

Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa. Ed. by T. Ganapati Sastri. TSS No. 16. Trivandrum, 1912.

Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa. With Com. by T. Ganapati Sastri. Trivandrum, 1920.

Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa. Gujarati Trans. (Pradhānanī Pratijñā) by K. H. Dhruva. Ahmedabad, 1922.

Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa. Gujarati Trans. (Pradhānanī Pratijñā) by K. H. Dhruva, 2nd Ed. Ahamedabad, 1923.

Pratimānāṭaka. Ed. by T. Ganapati Sastri. TSS N. 42. Trivandrum, 1915.

Pratimānāṭaka. Ed. with Com. by T. Ganapati Sastri. Trivandrum, 1924.

Pratimānāṭaka. Ed. with Intr, Trans, and Notes by S. M. Paranjape. Poona, 1927.

Pratimānāṭaka. Ed. with Intr, Transl, and Notes by C. R. Devdhar. Poona, 1930.

Pratimānāṭaka. Eng. Trans. by K. Rama Pisharoti. *QJMS*, XI, pp. 353-366; XII, pp. 58-66; 375-396; XIII, pp. 596-606; XIV, pp. 39-48.

Pratimānāṭaka. Gujarati Transl. by M. C. Bhatta. Ahmedabad, 1916.

Pratimānāṭaka. Ed. with Intr. and Gujarati Trans. by K. H. Dhruva. Ahmedabad, 1928.

Bālacartta. Ed. by T. Ganapati Sastri, TSS No. 21. Trivandrum, 1912.

Bālacarita. Schauspiel von Bhasa. Text herausgegeben von H. Weller. Leipzig, 1922.

Bālacarita (Die Abenteur des Knaben Krischna) Übersetzt von A. Weller. Leipzig, 1922.

Bālacarita. Eng. Trans. by K. Rama Pisharoti. *QJMS*, XXV, pp. 224-235 ; XXVI, pp. 19-33 ; 157-168. Reprint, pp. 1-39. Bangalore, 1936.

Madhyama. Ed. by T. Ganapati Sastri, TSS No. 22. Trivandrum, 1912.

Madhyama. Ed. with Com. by T. Ganapati Sastri Trivandrum, 1917.

Madhyama. Eng. Transl. by E. P. Janvier. Mysore, 1921.

Madhyama. Gujarati Transl. by Lalshankar Haraprasad. Bombay, 1917.

Madhyama. Gujarati Trans. by K. H. Dhruva. 2nd Ed. Ahmedabad. 1920.

Haiḍimba-Vaidagdhya. A stage adaptn. of Madhyama by T. S. Narayana Sastri.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Ed. by T. Ganapati Sastri. TSS No. 15. Trivandrum, 1912. 2nd Edn, 1915.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Ed. with Com. by T. Ganapati Sastri. Trivandrum, 1916, 1924.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Ed. with Com. N. S. Rajavade. and Intr. and Notes by H. B. Bhide. Bhavnagar, 1916.

Svapnavāsavadatta (Vision of Vāsavadattā). Ed. with Intr. Trans. Notes Appendices etc. by L. Sarup. Lahore, 1925.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Ed. with intr. transl. notes etc. by C. R. Devdhar. 2nd Ed. Poona, 1928.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Ed. with Intr. Transl. and Notes by S. Ray and K. Ray. Calcutta, 1936.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Eng. Transl. by A. G. Shirreff and Pannalal. Allahabad, 1918.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Eng. Transl. by S. Subbarao. Madras, 1917.

Svapnavāsavdatta. Literal English rendering by V. S. Sukthankar. *Shama'a*, II, pp. 137-169 ; III, pp. 25-45.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Eng. Trans. by V. S. Sukthankar. Oxford, 1923.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Eng. Transl. with Notes by K. Rama Pisharoti. *QJMS*, X, pp. 164-174 ; 209-220 ; 372-381 ; XI, pp. 122-137.

Svapnavāsavadatta. French translation by A. Baston. Paris, 1914.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Übersetzt von Hermann Jacobi. Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Knust, und Technik, 1913, pp. 653-690.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Übersetzt von H. Weller. Leipzig, 1926.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Gujarati Transl. (Sacām Svapna) with Intr. & Notes by K. H. Dhruva. Ahmedabad, 1916.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Gujarati Transl. (Svapnant Sundari) with Intr. and Notes by K. H. Dhruva, 2nd edition. Ahmedabad, 1923.

Svapnavāsavadatta. Marathi Transl. with Intro, Notes, and appendices by W. G. Urdhwareshe. Indore, 1927.

Svapnavāsavdatta. Ed. with Sanskrit Com. and Hindi Trans. by Narayan Sastri Khiste. Benares, 1936.

Svapnavāsavadatta. With Sanskrit Com. and Hindi Trans. by A. S. Vetal and J. S. Hosing. Benares, 1936.

Bhāsa Nāṭakacakram. Ed. by C. R. Devdhar. Poona, 1937.

Thirteen Trivandrum Plays. English translation by A. C. Woolner and L. Sarup. 3 Volumes, OUP, London, 1930-1931.

Bhāsa's Works (Marathi translation). BhāsācīmNāṭakem. By B. R. Hivargaokar. 2 Volumes. Ahmednagar, 1928-1929.

Bhāsa's Works. (Marathi translation). Bhāsācīm Nāṭakem. By K. L. Soman. Poona, 1931.

(B)

BOOKS AND ARTICLES ON THE BHĀSA PROBLEM.

Apte H. N.

Bhās kavīcyā nāṭaka-kathā. Poona, 1917. (in Marathi)

Āsūri Anantācārya.

Mahākavir bhāsaḥ. *SB*, IV, pp. 35-49 ; 80-90 ; 17-22 ; V, pp.1-16.

Banerji Sastri, A. P.

The Plays of Bhāsa. *JRAS*, 1921, pp. 367-382.
Bhāsa : His Age and Māgadhī. *JBORS*, 1923, pp. 49-113.
Dramatic Māgadhī. *JBORS*, 1923, pp. 163-178.

Barnett, L. D.

The Plays ascribed to Bhāsa and the *Mattavilāsa*. *JRAS*, 1919, pp. 233-234.
The *Mattavilāsa* and "Bhāsa". *BSOS*, I, pp. 35-38.
'Bhāsa'. *JRAS*, 1921, pp. 587-589.
Sanskrit Masculines Plural in *-āni*. *JRAS*, 1924, pp. 655-656.
Who is the Author of *Svapnavāsavadatta* ? *JRAS*, 1925, p. 99.
Kalyāṇasaugandhikam of Nīlakaṇṭha. *BSOS*, III, pp. 33-50.
Ābhāsa-Bhāsa. *BSOS*, III, pp. 519-522.
Rev. of *Svapnavāsavadatta* (Sukthankar). *BSOS*, III, p. 378.
Rev. of *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* (Hertel). *BSOS*, III, p. 586.
Rev. of *Mattavilāsa* (Hertel) and *Avimāraka* (Weller). *BSOS*, III. pp.590-591 ; also, JRAS, 1927, pp. 350-352.
Rev. of *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi* (S. K. Sastri). *BSOS*, IV, p. 631.
Rev. of *Śākuntala* (Harvard Or. Series). *JRAS*, 1927, pp. 867-870.

Belvalkar, S. K.

The Relation of Śūdraka's *Mṛcchakaṭika* to the *Cārudatta* of Bhāsa. *OC*, I, pp. 189-204.
The State of Hinduism and Buddhism as revealed in *Mṛcchakaṭika*. *JBHU*, I, pp. 21-27.

Bhandarkar, D. R.

Lectures on the Ancient History of India. (Carmichael Lectures, 1918) Calcutta, 1919. pp. 58-64 ; 69-70 : 80.

Bhattacharya, D. C.

Bhāsa and his alleged works. *Proc. A. S. B.*, 1917, p. cxiv.

Bhaṭṭanātha Svāmin.

Māyurāja. *IA*, 1912, pp. 139-143.

Thirteen Newly Discovered Dramas attributed to Bhāsa. *IA*, 1916, pp. 189-195.

Chaphekar, S. N.

Bhāsācīn Nāṭakem. *Manj*, Divali No., 1931, pp. 12-18. (in Marathi)

Charpentier, Jarl.

Some Remarks on the Hindu Drama. (2. Author and Date of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. 3. A Passage in the *Dūtavākya*.) *JRAS*, 1923, pp. 593-608.

Rev. of *Madhyama* (Janvier). *JRAS*, 1923, p. 453.

Śakāra. *JRAS*, 1925, pp. 237-246.

Rev. of Dramas of Bhāsa (Ghatak). *JRAS*, 1926 pp. 123-124.

Rev. of *Bhagavadajjukīyam* (Achan.) *JRAS*, 1927, pp. 604-605.

Chaudhury, P.

The Date of Bhāsa. *MR*, XIV, pp. 382-387.

Clark, W. E.

Māgadhī and Ardhamāgadhī (10. Māgadhī in Bhāsa). *JAOS*, XLIV, pp. 101-102.

Deb, H. K.

Udayana Vatsarāja. Calcutta, 1916.

India and the Persian Empire. *JASB*, XXIX, pp. 335-355.

Deshpande, R. D.

Bhāsa va Dhāvaka he niranirāḷe kavī hot. *VJV*, L, pp. 77-85. (in Marathi).

Bhāsa āṇi Kālidāsa. *VJV*, LI, pp. 19-28. (in Marathi).

Devadhar, C. R.

Plays Ascribed to Bhāsa : Their Authenticity and Merits. Poona, 1927.

Dhruva, K. H.

Parākramanī Prasādī. Ahmedabad, 1923. Introduction, pp. 17-21; Appendix II, pp. 50-51. (in Gujarati).

Svapnavāsavadatta upar navo prakāś. Ahmedabad, 1927. (in Gujarati).

Pratimānū lupta aṅga. Dvivedi Abhinandan Grantha, pp. 364-371. (in Gujarati).

Padyaracanānī Aitihāsik Ālocanā. Bombay, 1933. pp. 177, 205-207, 209 n30, 212-213, 215, 230, etc. (in Gujarati).

Dikshitar, V. R. R.

Hindu Administrative Institutions. Madras, 1929. p. 126 n2, etc.

The Mauryan Polity. Madras, 1930. pp. 12, 18-19.

Dillon, Myles.

Nāṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa. London, 1937.

D. R. B (handarkar).

Note on "A Poem by Bhāsa", *IA*, XLII, p. 53.

Garbe, R.

Bemerkungen zu Bhāsas *Bālacarita*. *Festgabe Jacobi*, pp. 126-130.

Ghatak, J. C.

The Dramas of Bhāsa. *JDL*, XII, pp. 1-46.

Gray, Louis H.

Vāsavadattā, a Sanskrit romance by Subandhu. Trans. with an Intr and Notes. New York, 1913. Intr, p. 11.

Guleri, Chandradhar.

A Poem by Bhāsa. *IA*, 1913, pp. 52-53.

Gune, P. D.

Pradyota, Udayana and Śreṇika-A Jain Legend. *ABI*, II, pp. 1-

Hall F.

Fragments of the Early Hindu Dramatists, Bhāsa, Rāmila and Somila. *JASB*, XXVIII, pp. 28-30.

Hariyappa, H. L.

Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa : A Critique. *QJMS*, XXIII, pp. 235-247 ; 520-533.

Hertel, Joh.

Jinakīrti's "Geschichte von Pāla und Gopāla". *BSGW*, 1917, pp. 123 ff.

Iyer, K. A. Subramania.

On the use of the prohibitive particle *'mā'* in the Trivandrum Plays. *OC*, V, Vol. 1, pp. 616-629.

Iyer, K. G. Sesha.

The Bhāsa Problem. *IHQ*, I, p. 361.

Jahagirdar, R. V.

A Note on the Ten Plays of Bhāsa. *IA*, 1931, pp. 41-45.

The Thirteen Plays scribed to Bhāsa. Sanskrit Literary Association, Dharwar, 1931, pp. 1-20.

Jayaswal, K. P.

The Plays of Bhāsa and King Darśaka of Magadha. *JASB*, 1913, pp. 259-269.

Statues of two Śaiśunāka Emperors. *JBORS*, V, pp. 88-106 ; also, 214-215 (A Note) ; 516-542 (Reply).

Johnston, E. H.

Random Notes on the Trivandrum Plays. *IA*, 1933, pp. 95-99 ; 111-118.

Jolly, J.

Kollektaneen zum Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra. Nachricht. Königl.. Gesell. Wissen. Zu Göttingen, 1916, p. 353.

Über das *Dāmakaprahasanam*. *Festgabe Garbe*, pp. 115-121.

Kale, M. R.

Ratnāvalī. Bombay, 1921. Intr. pp. xvii-xx.

Kane, P. V.

Kavi Bhās va tradracit naṭakem. *VJV*, 1920, pp. 97-102. (in Marathi).

Kundamālā and Bhāsa. *ABI*, VII, p. 155.

Gleanings from the Abhinavabhāratī. *PCV*, pp. 385-400.

Kavi, M. Ramakrishna.

Avantisundarīkathā of Daṇḍin. *OC*, II, pp. 193-201.

Two More Dramas of Bhāsa. *OC*, III, pp. 80-85.

Tāpasavatsarāja. *JAHRS*, I, pp. 155-166; also, OC, IV, Vol. 2, pp. 165-179.

Avantisundarī in *Svapnavāsavadatta*. *JAHRS*, II. p. 143.

Avantisundarīkathāsāra and Avantisundarīkathā of Daṇḍin. Madras, 1924. Introduction, pp. 7-10.

Kavi, M. Ramakrishna, and S. K. Ramanatha Sastri.

Caturbhāṇī. Patna, 1922. Introduction, pp. ii-iv.

Keith, A. Berriedale.

Notes on the Sanskrit Drama (1. Bhāsa). *BSOS*, III, pp. 295-297.

The *Nyāyaśāstra* of Medhātithi. *BSOS*, III, pp. 623-625.

Rev. of Über das Verhaltnis zwischen *Cārudatta* und *Mṛcchakaṭika* (Morgenstierne). *IA*, 1923, pp. 59-60.

Sanskrit Drama. Oxford, 1924. Chap. IV (pp. 91-126); also, pp. 38, 42, 66, 70, 74, 89, 185, 278, 292, 354, etc.

History of Sanskrit Literature. Oxford, 1928. Preface, pp. xii-xvi; also, pp. 11-12, 80, 271, 307, 316, 336, 386, 451, 461, etc.

Khuperkar, B. M.

Ābhās navbe Bhāsac. *Lokaśikṣaṇa*, Poona, Vol. 5, pp. 294-298; 324-329; 353-358; 395-402. (in Marathi)

Kirfel, W.

Beitrage zur Literaturwissenschaft und Geistes geschichte Indiens Festgabe Hermann Jacobi. Bonn, 1926. pp. 114-125; 126-130; 131-134.

Konow, Sten.

Rev. of *Mudrārākṣasa* (Hillebrandt). *IA*, 1914, pp. 65-67.

Zur Fruhgeschichte des indischen Theatres. *Festschrift Kuhn* pp. 106 ff.

Rev. of *Gopālakelīcandrikā* (Caland). *IA*, 1920, pp. 233-235.

Das indische Drama. Leipzig, 1920. pp. 51-56.

Krishnamachariar, M.

History of Classical Sanskrit Literature. Madras, 1906. p. 57.

History of Classical Sanskrit Literature. Madras, 1937..... pp. 552-568.

Krishnamachariar, R. V.

Priyadarśikā. Srirangam, 1927. *Bhūmikā*, pp. xxi-xxxiii.

Krishnasastri, A. R.

Bhāsa Kavi. Bangalore, 1933. (in Kannada)

Kulkarni, K. P.

Sanskrit Drama and Dramatists. Satara City, 1927. pp. 73-95.

Kulkarni, P. V.

The *Cārudatta* and the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. (Appendix I to Nerurkar's Edition of Mṛcchakaṭika, Bombay, 1924).

Lacôte, F.

La source de la Vāsavadattā de Bhāsa. *JA*, 1919, pp. 493-525.

Lele, M. V.

Śrī Mahākavi Bhāsakṛt nāṭak granth. *VJV*, XLV, pp. 417-425. (in Marathi)

Lesny, V.

Die Entwicklungsstufe des Prakrits in Bhāsa's dramen und Zeitaltern Bhāsa's. *ZDMG*, Vol. 72, pp. 203-208.

Lévi, S.

Deux nouveaux traités de dramaturgie indiennie. *JA*, 1923, pp. 193-218.

Le Théatre Indien. Paris, 1890. Vol. I, pp. 157-160; Vol. 2 pp. 31-32.

Lindenau, M.

Bhāsa-Studien. Leipzig, 1918.

Macdonell, A. A.

Three Plays of Bhāsa in the T. S. S. *JRAS*, 1913, pp. 186-190.

India's Past: A Survey of Her Literatures, Religions, Languages and Antiquities. London, 1927. pp. 104-108.

Madhava.

Bhāsakavi āṇi tyācā Rājasiṃha. *Manoranjan*, 1930, pp. 57-65; 111-117. (in Marathi)

Mahabal, B. B.

Bhās va Kālidās. (Dusari bājū). *VJV*, LI, pp. 73-80. (in Marathi)

Mankad, D. R.

Note on the Authorship of *Svapnavāsavadatta*. *ABI*, IX, pp. 333-334.

Bharatavākya and the *Bhagavadajjukam*. *IHQ*, VII, pp. 187-190.

Pratimā and *Kundamālā*. *ABI*, XII, pp. 97-98.

The Types of Sanskrit Drama. Karachi, 1936. pp. 29, 43, 55, 57-58, 60, 61, 64-65, etc.

Meerwarth, A. M.

The Dramas of Bhāsa. A Literary Study. *JASB*, XIII, pp. 261-280.

Mehendale, K. C.

Date of Śūdraka. *BCV*, pp. 369-374.

Menon, T. K. K.

Rev. of *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi* (S. K. Sastri). *IHQ*, III, pp. 220-223 ; also, *ABI*, VII, PP. 431-434.

Morgenstierne, G.

Über das Verhaltnis zwischen Cārudatta und Mṛcchakaṭika. Leipzig, 1921.

Narasimhachar, R.

Annual Report of the Arch. Survey of Mysore, 1909-10. p. 46.

Neglein, J. von.

Aus Indiens Kultur Festgabe Richard von Garbe. Erlangen, 1927. pp. 115-121.

Nerurkar, V. R.

Mṛcchakaṭikam. Bombay, 1924. Introduction, pp. 14-19.

Ogden, C. J.

Lexicographical and Grammatical Notes on the *Svapnavāsavadatta* o Bhāsa. *JAOS*, XXXV, pp. 269-272.

Bhāsa's Treatment of the Udayana Legend. *JAOS*, XLIII, p. 169.

Padhye, K. A.

Buddhism as depicted in Ancient Sanskrit Dramas. *IC*, IV, pp. 61-72.

Pangu, D. S.

Bhāsācā *Madhyamavyāyoga*. *CJ*, 1926, pp. 163-164. (in Marathi)

Śrī Bhāsakavikṛt *Pratimānāṭaka*. *CJ*. 1926, pp. 473-476. (in Marathi).

Pandeya, Ramavatara Sarma.

Mahākavir bhāsaḥ. *Śāradā*, Allahabad, Vol. 1, pp. 4-7.

Paranjape, S. M.

Cārudatta āṇi Mṛcchakaṭika. *CJ*, 1915, pp. 46 ff ; also in Sāhityasaṃgraha, Vol. 1, Poona, 1922. pp. 102-140. (in Marathi).

Priyadarśikā āṇi Nāgānanda hīṃ koṇāchīṃ ? *CJ*, 1915, pp. 576 ff ; also in Sāhityasaṃgraha, Vol. 1, Poona, 1922, pp. 141-186. (in Marathi)

Bhāsāvişayīṃ kāhī goṣṭī. *CJ*, 1916. pp. 91 ff. (in Marathi)

Bhāsāchī bhavitavyatā. *CJ*, 1916, pp. 381 ff ; also in Sāhityasaṃgraha, Vol. 1, Poona. 1922, pp. 18-32. (in Marathi).

Bhāsa vs Śaktibhadra. *ABI*, IX, pp. 1-9.

Pisharoti, A. Krishna

Bhāsa's Works : A Criticism. Trivandrum, 1925.

Pisharoti, K. Rama.

Acting in Kerala. *QJMS*, XII, pp. 183-185.

Svapnavāsavadatta and *Bhāvaprakāśa*. *BSOS*, III, pp. 639-642.

Traivikramam. *Shama'a*, 1924, pp. 213-222.

Keralanāṭakacakra. *JBRAS*, 1925, pp. 246-251.

The Bhāsa Problem. *IHQ*, I, pp. 103-111 ; 330-340.

Bhāsa Problem-A Criticism. *Shama'a*, 1925, pp. 173-186.

A Note on some unexplained Prakrit Passages. *JOR*, II, pp. 385-386.

The Bhāsa Theory Again. *IHQ*, V, pp. 552-558.

Sanskrit and Prakrit in the Ārya Eluttu. *BSOS*, V, pp. 307-310.

Nāndi, A Note. *BSOS*, VI, pp. 819-821

Kerala Theatre. *JAU*, I, pp. 91-113; III, pp. 141-159; *ADC*, pp. 48-57.

Pisharoti, K. Rama and A. Krishna Pisharoti.

Bhāsa's Works; Are They Genuine? *BSOS*, III, pp. 107-117.

Printz, W.

Bhāsa's Prakrit. Frankfurt, 1921.

Pusalker, A. D.

Critical Study of the Works of Bhāsa with special reference to the Sociological Conditions of his Age as revealed in those Works. *JUB*, II, pp. 174-203.

Authorship and Date of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. *JAHRS*, XI, pp. 33-42.

One Bhāsa Verse and its Bearing on the Bhāsa Problem. *IC*, IV, pp. 522-525.

Raddi, R. B.

Bhās kiṃ ābhās? *VJV*, XLII, pp. 121-126; 209-232. (in Marathi)

Raja, C. K.

Bhāsa: Another Side, *ZII*, II, pp. 247-264.

Some Unexplained Prakrit Passages and Their bearing on the Bhāsa Problem. *JOR*, I, pp 217-245.

A New Drama of Bhāsa (?) *OC*, VI, p. 593.

Viṇāvāsavadatta (Act IV). *JOR*, Dec. 1936, pp. ii 17.

Ramachandra Rao, S.

Tragedies in Sanskrit. Paper read at the VIIIth All-India Oriental Conference held at Mysore.

Ray, K.

Evolution of the Thoughts in Bhagavadgītā. Calcutta, 1933. Chap. IX (Bhāsa—The Dramatist), pp. 116-131.

Sampathgiri Rao, K.

The Indian Dramatic Tradition and How it Helps, *ADC*, pp. 128-144.

Sankar, K. G.

The Problem of Bhāsa. *AMV*, II, pp. 41-64.

Sarasvata, Kedaranatha.

Mahākavir bhāsaḥ. *SSP*, VII, pp. 307-311.

Sarasvati, A. R.

The Founder of the Vikrama Era. *QJMS*, XII, pp. 268-282.

The Age of Bhāravi and Daṇḍin. *QJMS*, XIII, pp. 670-688.

Sarma, Amaranatha.

Mahākavir bhāsaḥ. *Śāradā*, (Allahabad), Vol. 2, No. 4.

Sarma, Narayanadatta.

Svapnavāsavadattam. *Śāradā*, (Allahabad), Vol. 2, No. 1.

Sarma, Sivadatta.

Mahākavi Bhāsa aur uskā nāṭakacakra. *NPP*, 1932-34, pp. 121-191 ; 241-277. (in Hindi).

Sarup, L.

Poems and Plays of Bhāsa. *HR*, 1927, pp. 116-121 ; 207-212.

Sastri, G. Harihara.

The Bhāsa Problem : A Reply. *IHQ*, I, pp. 370-378.
Kharapaṭa and Mūladeva. *AMV*, I, pp. 224-227.
Some Unexplained Prakrit Passages : A Reply. *JOR*, II, pp. 210-219.

Sastri, Haraprasada.

Śiśunāga Statues. *JBORS*, V, pp. 552-563.
Sanskrit Culture in Modern India. *PB*, 1929, pp. 66-76 ; 126-136 ; also, *OC*, V, Vol. 1, pp. 62-110.

Sastri, Hirananda.

Bhāsa and the Authorship of the Thirteen Trivandrum Plays. MASI, No. 28. Calcutta, 1926.

Sastri, S. Kuppuswami.

Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi. Madras, 1926. Introduction, pp. 17-27 (Bearing of the Cūḍāmaṇi on the Bhāsa Controversy).
Vināvāsavadattam. Madras, 1931.

Sastri, T. Ganapati.

The *Svapnavāsavadatta* of Bhāsa. *JRAS*, 1924, pp. 668-669.
The Works of Bhāsa. *BSOS*, III, pp. 627-637.
Bhāsa's Works : A Critical Study. Trivandrum, 1925.

Sastri, V. Venkatarama.

Dāmaka Prahasanam. Lahore, 1926.

Saunders, Virginia.

Some Literary Aspects of the Absence of Tragedy in the Classical Sanskrit Drama. *JAOS*, XLI, pp. 152-156.
Magic in the Sanskrit Drama. *JAOS*, XLV, pp. 110-114.

Sen, Malati.

A Śloka of Bhāsa. *IHQ*, IX, pp. 580-581.
Some Notes on the Trivandrum Plays. *COJ*, I, pp. 31-33.
Vyāsa, Bhāsa and Kālidāsa. *COJ*, I, pp. 215-217.
A Śloka of Bhāsa. *COJ*, I, pp. 309-310.

Smith, V. A.

Discovery of the Plays of Bhāsa, a predecessor of Kālidāsa. *IA*, XL, pp. 87-89.

Stein, O.

Contributions to the Bhāsa Question. *IHQ*, XIV, pp. 633-659.

Sukthankar, V. S.

Studies in Bhāsa.

1. On certain Archaisms in the Prakrit of these dramas. *JAOS*, XL, pp. 248-259.
2. On the Versification of the Metrical Portions of these dramas. *JAOS*, XLI, pp. 107-130.
3. On the relationship between the *Cārudatta* and the *Mṛcchakaṭika*. *JAOS*, XLII, pp. 59-74.
4. A Concordance of the Dramas. *ABI*, IV, pp. 167-187.
5. A Bibliographical Note. *JBRAS*, XXVI, pp. 230-249.
6. On the Prakrit of the Dramas. *JBRAS*, 1925, pp. 103-117.

Cārudatta–A Fragment. *QJMS*, IX, pp. 181-185.

A Note on the Dramas of Bhāsa. *Shama'a* 1922, p. 59.

Bhāsa Riddle : A Proposed Solution. *JBORS*, 1925, pp. 126-143.

Reports and Summaries : Deux nouveaux traités de dramaturgie indienne. par Sylvain Lévi, *JA*, Octobre-Decembre, 1923, pp. 193-218. *JBORS*, 1925, pp. 270-276.

Foreword to Urdhwaresha's *Svapnavāsavadatta* (Marathi trans.), Indore, 1927, pp. 1-7.

Tatke, S. B.

Cārudatta ani *Mṛcchakaṭika*. *MS*, 1923, pp. 13-19 ; 78-84 ; 159-169. (in Marathi).

Thomas, F. W.

The Plays of Bhāsa. *JRAS*, 1922, pp. 79-83.

Rev. of *Bālacarita* (Weller). *IA*, 1923, p. 186.

Sanskrit Masculines Plural in *-āni*. *JRAS*, 1924, pp. 449-450.

Bhāsakṛta *Svapnavāsavadatta*. *JRAS*, 1925, pp. 100-104.

Bhāsa and Accusative Plural Masculine in *-āni*. *JRAS*, 1925, pp. 104-107.

The Date of the *Svapnavāsavadatta*. *JRAS*, 1928, pp. 877-890.

Vaidya, C. V.

Early Indian History with correct Dates found in the Skandapurāṇa. *OC*, VII, pp. 575-582.

Venkataraman T. L.

The Date of Bhāsa. *MR*, 1914, pp. 597-598.

Venkatarama Sarma V.

Svapnanāṭaka and *Svapnavāsavadatta*. *IHQ*, V, pp. 721-728.

A Note on *Bhagavadajjukam*. *BSOS*, V, pp. 33-35.

Venkataramayya, C. K.

Kālidāsa and Bhāsa in the Light of some Western Criticisms. *QJMS*, XVII, pp. 125-142.

Venkatasubbiah, A.

A Buddhist Parallel to the *Avimāraka* Story. *IA*, 1931, pp. 113-115.

Venkateswara, S. V.

The Tragic Sense in Sanskrit Poetry. *PB*, 1931, pp. 476-480.

Indian Culture through the Ages. 2 Vols. London, 1928 and

1932. Vol. 1, pp. 191, 215, 294; Vol. 2, pp. 104-106, 111-112.

Weller, Hermann.

Ein Beitrag zu der Bhāsas-Frage. *Festgabe Jacobi*, pp. 114-125.

Winternitz M.

Mahābhārata II. 68. 41 ff und Bhāsa's *Dūtavākya*. *Festschrift Kuhn*, 1917, pp. 299-304.

Kṛṣṇa-Dramen (2. Bhāsa's *Bālacarita*). *ZDMG*, 74, pp. 125-137.

Der indische Dramendichter Bhāsa. *OZ*, IX, pp. 282-299.

Bhāsa. *CR*, Dec. 1924, pp. 329-349; also in Some Problems of Indian Literature, Calcutta, 1925, pp. 110-130.

Rev. of Bhāsa's Works: A Critical Study (T. Ganapati Sastri). *WZKM*, XXXII, p. 292.

Bhāsa and the *Mahābhārata* and Kṛṣṇa Plays of the Trivandrum Series. *BRRI*, V, pp. 1-15.

Geschichte der indischen Litteratur. Band 3. pp. 184-202, 205 f, 209 f, 644-646, etc.

Preface to *Bhagavadajjukīyam* (P. Anujan Achan), Jayantamangalam, 1925, pp. vi-ix.

APPENDIX II

Subhāṣitas from the Works of Bhāsa.

अकारणं रूपमकारणं कुले महत्सु नीचेषु च कर्म शोभते। *Pañc*, II. 33, p. 74.
अकाले स्वस्खवाक्यं मन्दुमुत्पादयति। *Pañc*, p. 65.
अकुलीणो कहं एव्वं साणुक्कोसो भवे। *Avi*, p. 7.
अक्कोसन्तो वि पक्को इच्छिदव्वो। *Avi*, p. 31.
अच्छलो धर्मः। *Pañc*, p. 40.
अच्छलो हि स्नेहो नाम। *Avi*, p. 83.
अच्छलं मित्रत्वं नाम। *Avi*, p. 64.
अजुत्तं परपुरुससंकित्तणं सोदुं। *Svapna*, p. 55.
अजुत्तं पररहस्सं सोदुं। *Cār*, p. 92.
अब्भासणपरिग्गहेण अप्पो किल सिणेहो पडिभादि। *Svapna*, p. 107.
अणदिक्कमणीओ हि विही। Svapna, p. 85.

अतीत्य बन्धूनवलंब्य मित्राण्याचार्यमागच्छति शिष्यदोषः।
बालं क्षपत्वं गुरवे प्रदातुर्नैवापराधोऽस्ति पितुर्न मातुः॥ *Pañc*., I. 21, p. 15.

अदण्ड्यो नैव दण्ड्यते। *Abh*, p. 13.

अदत्तेत्यागता लज्जा दत्तेति व्यथितं मनः।
धर्मस्नेहान्तरे न्यस्ता दुःखिताः खलु मातरः॥ *Pratijñā*, II. 7, p. 53.

अदिदरिद्दपुरुससत्ता गणिआ अवअणीआ होदि। *Cār*, p. 46.
अनतिक्रमणीया विष्णोराज्ञा। *Bāl*, p. 25.

अनुचरति शशांकं राहुदोषेऽपि तारा पतति च वनवृक्षे वाति भूमिं लता च।
त्यजति न च करेणुः पंकलग्नं गजेन्द्रं व्रजतु चरतु धर्मं भर्तृनाथा हि नार्यः॥ *Prat*, I. 25, pp. 33-34.

अन्तकाले मनुष्याः किमपि पश्यन्ति। *Avi*, p. 63.
अयुक्तमधृतित्वं पुरुषाणाम्। *Avi*, p. 19.
अर्थित्वादपरिश्रान्तः पृच्छत्येव हि कार्यवान्। *Pañc*, II. 6, p. 56.
अलमलं बन्धुजने परुषमभिधातुम्। *Dv*, p. 17.
अल्पं तुल्यशीलानि द्वन्द्वानि सुज्यन्ते। *Prat*, p. 18.
अवश्यं भवितव्येऽर्थे कः प्रहर्षः। *Avi*, p. 29.
अवश्यं युधि वीराणां क्षयो वा विजयोऽथ वा। *Abh*, p. 38. n 4.

अवसरो खलु नाम शत्रुमपि सुहृत्त्वे कल्पयति । *Pratijñā*, p. 28.
अविज्ञातपुरुषविशेषाः खलु वानराः । *Prat*, p. 114.
अहिअमहुरस्स अम्बस्स अवोग्गदाए अण्ठी ण भक्खीअदि । *Cār*, p. 9.
अहो अपराह्णस्य प्रतिभयता । *Avi*, p. 43.
अहो अल्पमूलत्वं महतां चानर्घस्य । *Avi*, p. 97.
अहो कार्यमेवापेक्षते बुद्धिरमात्यानां न स्नेहम् । *Avi*, p. 13.
अहो तु खल्वतुलबलता कुसुमधन्वनः । *Abh*, p. 60.
अहो प्रच्छन्नरजता पृथिव्याः । *Avi*, p. 7.
अहो प्रतिभयता निदाघस्य । *Avi*, p. 58.
अहो बलमनङ्गस्य । *Avi*, p. 18.
अहो बलवान् हि भगवान् प्रजापतिः । *Avi*, p. 16.
अहो भवितव्यस्य प्रभावः । *Avi*, p. 46.
अहो महद्भारो राज्यं नाम । *Avi*, p. 13.
अहो विचित्रस्वभावता जगतः । *Avi*, p. 33.
अहो विसमसीला संवच्छरिआ णाम अत्तणो णक्खत्तविसेसं एव्व चिन्तअन्ति कम्मगोरवं ण जाणन्ति । *Avi*, pp. 90-91.

अहः सम्मुखीवं निशा प्रतीक्ष्यते, शुभे प्रभाते दिवसोऽनुचिन्यते ।
अनागतार्थान्यशुभानि पश्यतां, गतं गतं कालमवेक्ष्य निर्वृतिः ॥ *Pratijñā*, III. 2, p. 87.

आअदे चन्दे समाअदाणि सव्वणक्खत्ताणि । *Pratijñā*, p. 80.
आअमप्पहाणाणि सुलहपव्वदत्थाणाणि महापुरुसहिअआणि होन्ति । *Svapna*, p. 48.
आपदं हि पिता प्राप्तो ज्येष्ठपुत्रेण तार्यते । *Mr*, st. 19, p. 15.
आसाच्छेदं उक्कण्ठन्ता का सहेदि । *Cār*, p. 45.
इट्ठं आअन्तुअस्स भोअणदाणं । *Avi*, p. 87.

इयं हि निद्रा नयनावलम्बिनी, ललाटदेशादुपसर्पतीव माम् ।
अदृश्यमाना चपला जरेव या, मनुष्यवीर्यं परिभूय वर्धते ॥ *Cār*, III. 4, p. 68.

उक्कण्ठितं भत्तारं उज्झिअ अज्जुत्तं णिम्मग्गं । *Svapna*, p. 87.
उक्कडाः खलु नृशंसाः । *Bāl*, p. 14.
उक्कुप्पुप्फं सहआरं महुराओ उवासन्ति । *Cār*, p. 47.
उपोपविश्य प्रवेष्टव्यानि नगराणीति सत्समुदाचारः । *Prat*, p. 59.
एअस्सि दुल्लहो गुणविभवो । *Cār*, p. 54.
एकपुरुसपक्खवादिदा सव्वगुणाणं हन्ति । *Cār*, p. 61.

एकोदकत्वं खलु नाम लोके, मनस्विनां कम्पयते मनांसि । *Pañc*, II. 9, p. 58.
एकः परगृहं गच्छेद् द्वितीयेन तु मन्त्रयेत् ।
बहुभिः समरं कुर्यादित्यवं शास्त्रनिर्णयः ॥ *Avi*, II. 10, p. 31.

एवं खु मण्णे वासपादपविणासेण पक्खिणो आहिण्डन्ति त्ति । *Cār*, p. 56.
कण्णादंसणं णिद्दोसं । *Pratijñā*, p. 93.
कन्यापितुर्हि सततं बहु चिन्तनीयम् । *Avi*, I. 2, p. 3.
कन्यापितुत्वं बहु वन्दनीयम् । *Avi*, I. 9, p. 10.

कर्तव्यो आदृतः स्नेहो विरमर्तव्या गुणेतराः ।
सम्बन्धो बन्धुभिः श्रेयान् लोकयोरुभयोरपि ॥ *Dv*. st. 29, p. 19.

कल्पविशेषेण निवपनमिच्छन्ति पितरः। *Prat*, p. 96.
कष्टममात्यत्वं नाम। *Avi*, p. 4.
कष्टा खल्वात्मशङ्का नाम। *Cār*, p. 100.
कष्टं वनं स्त्रीजनसौकुमार्यं, समं लताभिः कठिनीकरोति। *Prat*, V. 3, p. 95.
कस्तावदौषधमुपलभ्य मन्दीभवत्यातुरः। *Avi*, p. 26.
का णाम मादा पुत्तअस्स अवराहं ण मरिसेदि। *Prat*, p. 121.
कातरा येऽप्यशक्ता वा नोत्साहस्तेषु जायते।
प्रायेण हि नरेन्द्रश्रीः सोत्साहैरेव भुज्यते॥ *Svapna*, VI. 7, p. 130.
कामो हि भअवं अणवगीदो ऊसुओ तरुणजणस्स। *Cār*, p. 44.
कालक्रमेण जगतः परिवर्तमाना चक्रारपङ्क्तिरिव गच्छति भाग्यपङ्क्तिः। *Svapna*, I. 4, p. 11.
काष्ठादग्निर्जायते मथ्यमानाद् भूमिस्तोयं खन्यमाना ददाति।
सोत्साहानां नास्त्यसाध्यं नराणां मार्गारब्धाः सर्वयत्नाः फलन्ति॥ *Pratijñā*, I. 18, p. 44.
किं तद् द्रव्यं किं फलं को विशेषः,
क्षत्राचार्यो यत्र विप्रो दरिद्रः। *Pañc*, I. 30, p. 24.
किं अज्ञानामपि परेण निवेदनं क्रियते। *Prat*, p. 78.
किं वा न कारयति मन्मथः। *Cār*, p. 72.
किं सक्कं कतुं अन्तरेण विहारं। *Pratijñā*, p. 39.
किं सरणाअदो पुच्छीअदि। *Cār*, p. 49.
कुतः क्रोधो विनीतानां लब्धा वा कृतचेतसाम्। *Prat*, VI. 9, p. 114.
कृतापराधस्य हि सत्कृतिर्वधः। *Pratijñā*, IV. 23, p. 125.
के रक्षन्ति रक्षितात्मानम्। *Avi*, p. 45.
को नाम लोके स्वयमात्मदोषमुद्घाटयेन्नष्टघृणः सभासु। *Dv*, st. 18, p. 14.
को वा पुत्रं मर्षयेच्छत्रुहस्ते। *Pañc*, II. 46, p. 82.
को विस्समो णाम विम्भट्ठमणोरहाणं। *Avi*, p. 70.
को सक्कदि उच्छिट्ठं ण करन्तो मुञ्चिदुं। *Avi*, p. 78.
को हि णाम अप्पणा किदं पच्चुअआरेण विणासेदि। *Cār*, p. 57.
को हि णाम जीविदेण सरीरं विक्कीणिस्सदि। *Cār*, p. 93.
को हि समर्थः सन्निहितशार्दूलां गुहां मर्षयितुम्। *Dgh*, p. 55.
कः कं शक्तो रक्षितुं मृत्युकाले रज्जुच्छेदे के घटं धारयन्ति।
एवं लोकस्तुल्यधर्मो बलानां काले काले क्षिपते रक्षते च॥ *Svapna*, VI. 10, p. 132.
कः शक्तः सूर्यं हस्तेनाच्छादयितुम्। *Avi*, p. 8.
गुणबाहुल्यं तदात्वमावर्ति चावेक्ष्य त्वरतां दीर्घसूत्रतां च परिहृत्य देशकालाविरोधेन साधयितव्यं कार्यम्। *Avi*, pp. 10-11.
गुणवन्तो रक्खिदव्वो होदि। *Cār*, p. 49.
गुणानां वा विशालानां सत्काराणां च नित्यशः।
कर्तारः सुलभा लोके विज्ञातारस्तु दुर्लभाः॥ *Svapna*, IV. 10, p. 91.
गोपहीना यथा गावो विलयं यान्त्यपालिताः।
एवं नृपतिहीना हि विलयं यान्ति वै प्रजाः॥ *Prat*, III. 23, p. 73.
चम्पआरामे पिच्चुमन्दा वा अन्ति। *Cār*, p. 88.
चीरमात्रोत्तरीयाणां किं दृश्यं वनवासिनाम्। *Prat*, I. 31, p. 37.

क्षुद्रा भवन्ति भुवि सत्पुरुषाः कथञ्चित् क्लेशैः कारणैर्गुरुजनैश्च नियम्यमानाः।
भूयः परव्यसनमेत्य विमोक्तुकामा विस्मृत्य पूर्वनियमं विकृता भवन्ति॥ *Avi*, I. 6. p. 8.

जनयति खलु रोषं प्रश्रयो मिथ्यमानः। *Cār*, I. 14, p. 20.
जाग्रतोऽपि हि बलवत्तरः कृतान्तः। *Pratijñā*, p. 18.
जामातृसम्पत्तिमचिन्तयित्वा पित्रा तु दत्ता स्वमनोभिलाषात्।
कुलद्वयं हन्ति मदेन नारी कुलद्वयं ध्रुवज्वला नदीव॥ *Avi*, I. pp. 3-4.
ज्येष्ठो भ्राता पितृसमः। *Mv*, St. 18, p. 15.
ज्येष्ठः श्रेष्ठः कुले लोके पितॄणां च सुसम्मितः। *Mv*. St. 17, p. 14.
ण किं सक्कं रक्खिदुं पत्तकाले। *Svapna*, p. 127.
ण जाणन्ति अवत्थाविसेसं इत्तरपुत्ता णाम। *Avi*, p. 14.
णणु पुप्फं वि वासीअदि। *Avi*, p. 55.
ण हि चित्तब्भवेण पित्तं णस्सदि। *Avi*, p. 87.
तवोवणाणि णाम अदिहिजणस्स सव्वगेहं। *Svapna*, p. 16.
तस्मिन्सर्वमधीनं हि यत्राधीनो नराधिपः। *Svapna*, I. 15, p. 33.
ताडितस्य हि योधस्य क्षणनीवेव कर्मणा।
अकालान्तरिता पूजा नाशयत्येव वेदनाम्॥ *Pañc*, II. 28, p. 71.
तिर्यग्योनयोऽप्युपकृतमवगच्छन्ति। *Prat*, p. 114.
तुल्येऽपि कालविशेषे निश्चैव बहुदोषा बन्धनेषु। *Pratijñā*, p. 87.
तेजस्वि भाक्षण्यम्। *Pañc*, p. 33.
दक्खो वेसवासजणो। *Cār*, p. 88.
दारिकासु स्त्रीणामधिकतरः स्नेहो भवति। *Bāl*, p. 29.
दारिद्र्यं खलु नाम मनस्विनः पुरुषस्य सोच्छ्वासं मरणम्। *Cār*, p. 11.
दारिद्र्यात्पुरुषस्य बान्धवजनो वाक्यं न सन्तिष्ठते
सर्वं ह्रास्यमुपैति शीलशशिनः कान्तिः परिम्लायते।
निर्वैरा विमुखीभवन्ति सुहृदः स्कारीभवन्त्यापदः
पापं कर्म च यत्परैरपि कृतं तत्तस्य सम्भाव्यते॥ *Cār*, I. 6, p. 15.
दुरारक्खदाए आसण्णदोसाणि विसअन्तराणि। *Pratijñā*, p. 19.
दुहितुः प्रदानकाले दुःखशीला हि मातरः। *Pratijñā*, p. 50.
दुःखं स्वप्ने बद्धमूलोऽनुरागः स्मृत्वा स्मृत्वा याति दुःखं नवत्वम्।
यावत्त्वेषा यद् विमुञ्चेद् बाष्पं प्राप्तानृण्या याति बुद्धिः प्रसादम्॥ *Svapna*, IV. 7, p. 85.
दूतवधः खलु वचनीयः। *Abh*, p. 43.
देशकालावस्थापेक्षि खलु शौर्यं नयानुगामिनाम्। *Dv*, p. 18.
दैवमत्र कन्याप्रदानेऽधिकृतम्। *Pratijñā*, p. 45.
भृत्याधिकारमवमानमसूयमाणाः
सत्त्वाधिकेषु वचनीयपराक्रमाः स्युः॥ *Dv*, St. 11, p. 11.
धम्मा खु चक्कवाअवहू, जा अण्णोण्णविरहिदा ण जीवइ। *Svapna*, pp. 51-52.
धर्मो हि यत्नैः पुरुषेण साध्यो भुजंगजिह्वाचपला नृपश्रियः।
तस्मात् प्रजापालनमात्रबुद्धया इतेषु देहेषु गुणा धरन्ते॥ *Karṇa*, St. 17, p. 79.

धर्मं समाचर सुत (? कुरु) स्वजनव्यपेक्षां
यत्काङ्क्षितं मनसि सर्वमिहानुतिष्ठ । *Dgh*, St. 52. p. 70.
धर्मः प्रागेव चिन्त्यः सचिवमतिगतिः प्रेक्षितव्या स्वबुद्धया
प्रच्छायौ रागरोषौ मृदुपरुषगुणौ कालयोगेन कार्यौ ।
ज्ञेयं लोकानुवृत्तं परचरनयनैर्मण्डलं प्रेक्षितव्यं
रक्ष्यो वज्रादिदात्मा रणशिरसि पुनः सोऽपि नावेक्षितव्यः ॥ *Avi*, I. 12, p. 13.
धिगयुक्तमनुशोचितुम् । *Karṇa*, p. 82.
धिगस्तु खलु दारिद्र्यमनिर्वेदं च यौवनम् ।
यदिदं दारुणं कर्म निन्दामि च करोमि च ॥ *Cār*, III. 14. p. 78.
न च दहति न कश्चित् सञ्जिकृष्टो रणाग्निः । *Pañc*, II. 15. p. 61.
न तथा रक्षमासाद्य सुजनः परितुष्यति ।
यथा च तद्दताकाङ्क्षे पात्रे दत्त्वा प्रहृष्यति ॥ *Avi*, IV. 14, p. 65.
न तु कुलविकलानां वर्तते वृत्तशुद्धिः । *Avi*, II. 5, p. 21.
न तु ··· दीनं वीरो निहन्ति समरेषु ··· । *Ūru*, St. 22, p. 94.
न त्वेव हि कदाचिज्ज्येष्ठस्य यवीयसो दाराभिमर्शनम् । *Abh*, p. 13.
न न्याय्यं परदोषमभिधातुम् । *Prat*, p. 78.
न पुष्पमोक्षणमर्हति कन्या । *Cār*, p. 21.
न पौरुषं वै परदूषणीयं न चेद्विसंवादमुपैति दैवम् । *Avi*, II. 8, p. 27.
न भृत्यदूषणीया राजानः । स्वामिनो हि स्वान्यमभाव्यानाम् । *Avi*, p. 11.
नरः प्रत्युपकारार्थी विपत्तौ लभते फलम् । *Cār*, IV. 7, p. 102.
न विस्तराहाणि विप्रियाणि । *Pañc*, p. 54.
नवं शरावं सलिलैः सुपूर्णं सुसंस्कृतं दर्भकृतोत्तरीयम् ।
तत्तस्य मा भून्नरकं स गच्छेद्यो भर्तुपिण्डस्य कृते न युध्येत् ॥ *Pratijñā*, IV. 3, p. 111.
न व्याघ्रं मृगशिशवः प्रधर्षयन्ति । *Prat*, V. 11, p. 106.
न शक्यं खलु विषमस्थैः पुरुषैः राजबलाधानं कर्तुम् । *Ūru*, p. 91.
न शक्यं मनो जेतुम् । *Avi*, p. 19.
न शक्यं लोकस्याधिष्ठानभूतं कृतान्तं वञ्चयितुम् । *Bāl*, p. 12.
न हि न परिपाल्या गुरुतयः । *Pratijñā*, II. 4. p. 49.
···न हि सिद्धवाक्या·
न्युत्क्रम्य गच्छति विधिः सुपरीक्षितानि । *Svapna*, I. 11, p. 24.
न शासनस्य नागेन्द्रं वैजयन्ती निषालयते । *Pratijñā*, IV. 20, p. 123.
निम्नस्थलोत्पादको हि कालः । *Prat*, p. 125.
निर्दोषदृश्या हि भवन्ति नार्यो यज्ञे विवाहे व्यसने वने च ॥ *Prat*, I. 29, p. 36.
निर्वेद एव खल्वनुक्तग्राहिणं स्वामिनमुपाश्रितस्य भृत्यजनस्य । *Abh*, p. 40.
निर्वेदप्रत्यर्थिनी खलु प्रार्थना । *Mv*, p. 11.
निष्परिहारा व्यापदः । *Avi*, p. 6.
निष्प्रतिवचनमृषिवचनम् । *Avi*, p. 103.
नीते रक्षे भाजने को निरोधः । *Pratijñā*, IV. 2. p. 117.

नैवेदानीं तादृशाश्चक्रवाका नैवाप्यन्ते स्त्रीविशेषैर्वियुक्ताः।
धन्या सा स्त्री यां तथा वेत्ति भर्ता भर्तुर्स्नेहात् सा हि दग्धाप्यदग्धा ॥ *Svapna*, I. 13, p. 31.

नोत्सहन्ते महात्मानो ह्यात्मानमपस्तोतुम्। *Pañc*, p. 20.
न्यस्तशस्त्रं हि को हन्यात्। *Pañc*, II. 52, p. 86.
पदिमत्तधम्मिणो पदिव्वदत्ति णाम। *Mv*, p. 13.
परचक्रैरनाक्रान्ता धर्मसंकरवर्जिता।
भूमिर्भर्तारमासाद्य रक्षिता परिरक्षति ॥ *Pratijñā*, I. 9, p. 27.
परस्परगता लोके दृश्यते रूपतुल्यता। *Svapna*, VI. 14, p. 136.
परोक्षो न स्वर्गो बहुगुणमिहैवेष फलति। *Pañc*, I. 23, p. 17.
पित्रणिवेदिज्जमाणाणि पित्राणि पित्रदराणि होन्ति। *Avi*, p. 39.
पित्रोरनिष्टः कस्येदानीं प्रियः। *Mv*, p. 15.
पुण्यसञ्चयसम्प्राप्तामधिगम्य नृपश्रियम्।
बन्धवेषः सुहृद्बन्धून् स भवेद्विफलश्रमः ॥ *Dv*, St. 25, p. 17.
पुरुषमयो धनुर्वेदः। *Pañc*, p. 105.
पुरुषाणां मातृदोषो न दोषः। *Prat*, IV. 21, p. 88.
पुरुसजोव्वणाणि किर गिहजोव्वणाणि खु दसाविसेसं अणुहोन्ति। *Cār*, pp. 12-13.
पूज्यतमः खलु ब्राह्मणः। *Mv*, p. 30
पूर्वं तावद् युक्तसम्बद्धदोषाः प्रस्तोतव्या भावनाः संश्रयाणाम्।
सन्दिग्धेऽर्थे चिन्त्यमाने विनाशे रूढे शोके कार्यतत्त्वं निवेश्यम् ॥ *Pratijñā*, I. 13, p. 33.
प्रणिपतति निरुद्धः सत्कृतो धर्षितो वा। *Pratijñā*, I. 11, p. 30.
प्रद्वेषो बहुमानो वा सङ्कल्पादुपजायते। *Svapna*, I. 7, p. 15.
प्रसिद्धौ कार्याणां प्रवदति जनः पार्थिवबलं
विपत्तौ विस्पष्टं सचिवमतिदोषं जनयति।
अमात्या इत्युक्ता श्रुतिसुखमुदारं नृपतिभिः
सुसूक्ष्मं दण्ड्यन्ते मतिबलविदग्धाः कुपुरुषाः ॥ *Avi*, I. 5, p. 4.
प्राज्ञस्य मूर्खस्य च कार्ययोगे
समत्वमभ्येति तनुर्न बुद्धिः। *Avi*, IV. 5, p. 83.
प्रियवचनपरिहार्या हि देवी। *Pratijñā*, p. 55.
बन्धुस्नेहाद्धि महतः कालक्षेपस्तु दुर्लभः। *Mv*, St. 20, p. 16.
बलवान् पुत्तसेहो नाम। *Avi*, pp. 94, 95.
बहुमुखा विवाहा यथेष्टं साध्यन्ते। *Avi*, p. 13.
बहुविघ्नानि सुहृदाम्। *Avi*, p. 56.
बहुविषमश्च सुखश्च राज्यविचारः। *Avi*, III. 11, p. 46.
बहुदुत्तन्ताणि राअउलाणि णाम। *Prat*, pp. 15, 17.
ब्राह्मणो दुल्लहो अक्खरम्भो अत्थम्भो अ। *Avi*, p. 16.
ब्राह्मणाधीना क्षत्रियाणां समृद्धिः। *Pañc*, I. 24, p. 18.
ब्राह्मजनधारितमलङ्कारं गृहजनो न द्रक्ष्यति। *Cār*, p. 70.
भक्त्या तुष्यन्ति दैवतानि। *Cār*, p. 27.

अर्धूद्रोहादस्तु माताप्यमाता । *Prat*, III. 18, p. 71.
भाग्यक्रमेण हि धनानि पुनर्भवन्ति । *Cār*, I. 5, p. 14.
भीदाइ वा पधरिसिदाइ वा अवण्णाइ वा मुलभचालिसवच्छणाइ वा अवराहेदुं समत्था होन्ति । *Cār*, p. 49.
भेदाः परस्परगता हि महाकुलानां धर्माधिकारवचनेषु शमीभवन्ति । *Pañc*, I. 41, p. 34.
भोः ! कष्टं तारुण्यं नाम । *Avi*, p. 42.
मज्जमानमकार्येषु पुरुषं विषयेषु वै ।
निवारयति यो राजन् स मित्रं रिपुरन्यथा ॥ *Abh*, VII. 3, p. 76.
मनश्च तावदस्मदिच्छया न प्रवर्तते । *Avi*, p. 19.
मनुष्याणामस्त्वेव सम्भ्रमः । *Dv*, p. 8.
मरुत्प्रपातो हि सर्वार्थसाधकः । *Avi*, p. 60.
महुरं पि बहु खादिअं अजिण्णं होइ । *Cār*, p. 65.
माता किल मनुष्याणां दैवतानां च दैवतम् । *Mv*, St. 37, p. 28.
मानशरीरा राजानः । *Ūru*, p. 113.
मिथ्याप्रशंसा खलु नाम कष्टा । *Pañc*, II. 60, p. 90.
मृतेऽपि हि नराः सर्वे सत्ये तिष्ठन्ति तिष्ठति । *Pañc*, III. 25, p. 114.
यत्ने कृते यदि न सिध्यति कोऽत्र दोषः
को वा न सिध्यति समेति करोति कार्यम् ।
यत्नैः शुभैः पुरुषता भवतीह नृणां
दैवं विधानमनुगच्छति कार्यसिद्धिः ॥ *Avi*, III. 12, p. 46.
रणशिरसि गवार्थे नास्ति मोघः प्रयत्नो
निधनमपि यशः स्यान्मोक्षयित्वा तु धर्मः ॥ *Pañc*, II. 5, p. 55.
राज्यं नाम नृपात्मजैः सहृदयैर्जित्वा रिपून्भुज्यते
तत्तोके न तु याच्यते न तु पुनर्दीनाय वा दीयते । *Dv*, St. 24, p. 17.
राज्यं नाम मुहूर्तमपि नोपेक्षणीयम् । *Prat*, p. 92.
रुष्टोऽपि कुञ्जरो बन्धो न स्याद्यं धर्षयेद्वने । *Mv*, St. 44, p. 33.
रूपेण खिद्यः कथ्यन्ते । पराक्रमेण तु पुरुषाः । *Pañc*, p. 106.
लतया सक्तया स्कन्धे शुष्कया वेष्टितस्तरुः ।
निविष्टो दुष्कुले साधुः क्षोदोषेणेव दह्यते ॥ *Pañc*, I. 14, p. 11.
लहुअणस्स सुलहो विब्भमो । *Cār*, p. 59.
वायुराच्छन्नमाश्रित्य मृगाणामिष्यते वधः । *Abh*, I. 19, p. 12.
वाचानुवृत्तिः खल्वतिथिसत्कारः । *Prat*, p. 99.
विधिरनतिक्रमणीयः । *Prat*, p. 45.
विवाहा नाम बहुशः परीक्ष्य कर्तव्या भवन्ति । *Avi*, p. 3.
वीणा नामासमुद्रोत्थितं रत्नम् । *Cār*, p. 64.
व्यवहारेष्वसाध्यानां लोके वाप्रतिरक्षताम् ।
प्रभाते दृष्टदोषाणां वैरिणां रजनी भवम् ॥ *Pratijñā*, III. 3, p. 88.
शङ्कनीया हि लोकेषु निष्प्रभावा दरिद्रता । *Cār*, III. 15, p. 80.
शरीरेऽरिः प्रहरति हृदये स्वजनस्तथा । *Prat*, I. 12, p. 25.
शिक्षा क्षयं गच्छति कालपर्ययात् सुबद्धमूला निपतन्ति पादपाः ।

जलं जलस्थानगतं च शुष्यति हुतं च दत्तं च तथैव तिष्ठति ॥ *Karṇa*, St. 23, p. 82.

श्रीमं सन्तोषमिच्छति । *Pañc*, II. 8, p. 57.

सक्कारो हि णाम सक्कारेण पडिच्छिदो पीदिं उप्पादेदि । *Svapna*, p. 90.

सङ्कुप्यमानो हि विजृम्भते मदनः । *Avi*, p. 19.

सङ्कुआरिणो अणत्थ । *Avi*, p. 14.

सति च कुलविरोधे नापराध्यन्ति बालाः । *Pañc*, III. 4, p. 102.

सदक्खिम्मस्स जणस्स परिजणो वि सदक्खिम्मो एव्व होदि । *Svapna*, p. 88.

सदृशं वयसः किं परव्यापारवीक्षणम् । *Avi*, p. 44.

सन्दिग्धेऽर्थे चिन्त्यमाने विनाशे रूढे शोके कार्यतत्त्वं निवेद्यम् । *Pratijñā*, I. 13, p. 33.

सभावरमणीआणि मण्डिदाणि अदिरमणीआणि होन्ति । *Avi*, p. 55.

समरावञ्चितानां रत्नानामिष्टसम्योगः प्रतीतिमुत्पादयति । *Pratijñā*, p. 62.

समागतानां युक्तः प्रीत्याया परिग्रहः । *Pratijñā*, p. 48.

समूलं वृक्षमुत्पाट्य शाखाश्छेत्तुं कुतः श्रमः । *Pratijñā*, IV. 24, p. 124.

सर्वजनसाधारणमाश्रमपदं नाम । *Svapna*, p. 26.

सर्वत्र दाक्षिण्यं न कर्तव्यम् । *Avi*, p. 10.

··· सर्वत्र सदा च नाम
द्विजोत्तमाः पूज्यतमाः पृथिव्याम् । *Mv*, St. 9, p. 8,

सर्वमिष्टेषु कथ्यते । *Pañc*, III. 13, p. 108.

सर्वा नरेन्द्रा हि नरेन्द्रकन्यां
महाः पताकामिव तर्कयन्ति । *Avi*, I. 9, p. 10.

सर्वापराधेष्ववध्याः खलु दूताः । *Abh*, p. 41.

सर्वाः प्रजाः क्षत्रियाणां पुत्रशब्देनाभिधीयन्ते । *Mv*, p. 31.

सर्वोऽपि हि कन्याप्रदानं प्रति पृष्ठश्चेत् परच्छन्देन तिष्ठति । *Pratijñā*, p. 48.

सर्वं श्रद्धया दत्तं श्राद्धम् । *Prat*, p. 100.

सर्वं हि सैन्यमनुरागमृते कलत्रम् । *Pratijñā*, I. 4, p. 10.

सव्वजणमणोहिरामं खु सोभग्गं णाम । *Svapna*, p. 45.

सव्वसोहणीयं सुरूवं णाम । *Prat*, p. 11.

सव्वहा सङ्कणीओ रतिच्छण्णो परिहप्पवेसो । *Avi*, p. 30.

सव्वं अलङ्कारो होदि सुरूवाणं । *Avi*, p. 28.

सहोजणसपत्तीओ गणिआजणो णाम । *Cār*, p. 89.

साधिमश्वासो निर्वातवितव्यः । *Svapna*, p. 139.

सान्त्वं हि नाम दुर्विनीतानामौषधम् । *Pañc*, p. 33.

साहसे खलु श्रीर्वसति । *Cār*, p. 93.

सुकलत्ता णणु पुच्छिदव्वा । *Prat*, p. 72.

सुखमर्थो भवेद्दातुं सुखं प्राणाः सुखं तपः ।
सुखमन्यद्भवेत्सर्वं दुःखं न्यासस्य रक्षणम् ॥ *Svapna*, I. 10, p. 21.

सुखं खलु निष्फलत्राणां कान्तारप्रवेशः, रमणीयतरः खलु प्राप्तमनोरथानां विनिपातः, अपश्चात्तापकरः खलु सञ्चितधर्माणां मृत्युः । *Pratijñā*, p. 114.

सुखं हि दुःखान्यनुभूय शोभते यथान्धकारादिव दीपदर्शनम् ।
सुखात् तु यो याति दशां दरिद्रतां क्षितः शरीरेण मृतः स जीवति ॥ *Cār*, I. 3, p. 13.
सुलभशरणमाश्रयो भयानां वनगहनं तिमिरं च तुल्यमेव ।
उभयमपि हि रक्षतेऽन्धकारो जनयति यश्च भयानि यश्च भीतः ॥ *Cār*, I. 20, p. 25.
सुलहावराहो परिअणो णाम । *Prat*, p. 9.
सुहं णामअपरिभूदं अकहत्तं च । *Svapna*, p. 60.
खिन्नेष्वासज्यं कर्म बहुष्करं स्याद् यो वा विधाता सत्कृतानां गुणानाम् ।
कीर्तं सामर्थ्यं यस्य तस्य क्रमेण दैवप्रामाण्याद् भ्रश्यते वर्धते वा ॥ *Pratijñā*, I. 3, pp. 6-7.
सेहदुब्बलं मादुहृदयं रक्ष्यम् । *Pratijñā*, p. 32.
स्मरतापि भयं राज्ञा भयं न स्मरतापि वा ।
उभाभ्यामपि गन्तव्यो भयादप्यभयादपि ॥ *Bāl*, II. 13, p. 28.
स्वः पुत्रः कुरुते पितुर्यदि वचः कस्तत्र भो विस्मयः । *Prat*, I. 5, p. 16.
स्वैर्दोषैर्भवति हि शङ्कितो मनुष्यः । *Cār*, IV. 6, p. 100.
हतोऽपि लभते स्वर्गं जित्वापि लभते यशः ।
उभे वर्तुमते लोके नास्ति निष्फलता रणे ॥ *Karṇa*, St. 12, p. 76.
हत्थिहत्थचञ्चलाणि पुरुसभग्गाणि होन्ति । *Avi*, p. 28.
हस्तस्पर्शो हि मातृणामजलस्य जलाञ्जलिः । *Prat*, III. 12, p. 66.

APPENDIX III.

Anthology Verses and Verses Ascribed to Bhâsa.

As has already been observed in Chap. IV, Dr. Sarup, Dr. Thomas and Dr. Weller think that some of the following verses might have come from Bhâsa. Such verses have been indicated below.

1. तीक्ष्णं रविस्तपति नीच इवानिराढ्यः श्लक्ष्णं रसत्यजति मित्रमिवाकृतज्ञः।
तोयं प्रसीदति मुनेरिव चित्तमन्तः कामी दरिद्र इव शोषमुपैति पङ्कः॥

(Sarup; Thomas; Weller)

2. दुःखार्तं मयि दुःखिता भवति या हृष्टे प्रहृष्टा तथा
दीने दैन्यमुपैति रोषपरुषे पथ्यं वचो भाषते।
काले वेत्ति कथाः करोति निपुणा मस्संस्तवे रज्यति
भार्या मन्त्रिवरः सखा परिजनः सैका बहुत्वं गता॥

(Sarup; Weller)

3. विरहिवनितावक्त्रीपम्यं बिभर्ति निशापतिर्गलितविभवस्याङ्केनाथ द्युतिर्मसृणा रवेः।
अभिनवबधूरोषस्यादुः करीषतनूनपादसरलजनाश्लेषक्रूरस्तुषारसमीरणः॥

(Sarup; Weller)

4. बाला च सा विदितपञ्चशरप्रपञ्चा तन्वी च सा स्तनभरोपचिताङ्गयष्टिः।
लज्जां समुद्वहति सा सुरतावसाने हा कापि सा किमिव किं कथयामि तस्याः॥

(Sarup; Weller)

5. यदपि विधुः सिन्धोरन्तः कथंचिदुपार्जितं तदपि सकलं चारुस्त्रीणां मुखेषु विलोक्यते।
सुरसुमनसः श्वासामोदे शशी च कपोलयोरमृतमधरे तिर्यग्भूते विषं च विलोचने॥

(Sarup; Weller)

6. प्रत्यासन्नविवाहमङ्गलविधौ देवार्चनव्यस्तया
दृष्ट्वाग्रे परिणेतुरेव लिखितां गङ्गाधरस्याकृतिम्।
उन्मादस्मितरोषलज्जितरसैर्गौर्या कथंचिच्चिराद्
इत्यस्त्रीवचनाद् प्रिये विनिहतः पुष्पाञ्जलिः पातु वः॥

(Sarup ; Weller)

7. कठिनहृदये मुग्ध क्रोधं सुखप्रतिघातकं लिखति दिवसं यातं यातं यमः किल मानिनि।
वयसि तरुणे मैतच्छक्यं चले च समागमे भवति कलहो यावत् तावद् वरं सुभगे रतम् ॥

(Sarup)

8. कृतकृतकैर्मायासख्यैस्त्वयास्मवतिवञ्चिता निभृतनिभृतैः कार्यालापैर्मयाप्युपलक्षितम्।
भवतु विदितं नेष्टाहं ते वृथा परिखिद्यसे ह्यहमसदृना त्वं निःस्नेहः समेन समं गतम् ॥

(Sarup)

9. दग्धे मनोभवतरौ बाला कुचकुम्भसंभृतैरश्रुतैः।
विगलीकृतालवाला जाता रोमावली वल्ली ॥

(Sarup)

10. अस्या ललाटे रचिता सखीभिर्विभाव्यते चन्दनपत्रलेखा।
आपाण्डुरश्यामकपोलभित्तावनङ्गबाणभ्रमपट्टिकेव ॥

(Sarup ; Thomas)

11. कपोले मार्जारः पय इति करांश्छेदि शशिनस्तकच्छिद्रप्रोतान् विसमिति करी संकलयति।
रतान्ते तल्पस्थान् हरति वनिताप्यंशुकमिति प्रभामत्तश्चन्द्रो जगदिदमहो विप्लवयति ॥

(Weller)

12. दयितावाहुपाशस्य कुतोऽयमपरो विधिः।
जीवत्यर्पितः कण्ठे मारवत्यपवर्जितः ॥

(Thomas)

13. पेवा सुरा प्रियतमामुखमीक्षणीयं ग्राह्यः स्वभावललितो विकटश्च वेषः।
वेनेदमीदृशमदृश्यत मोक्षवर्त्म दीर्घायुरस्तु भगवान् स पिनाकपाणिः ॥

14. पादाक्रान्तानि पुष्पाणि सोष्म चेदं शिलातलम्।
नूनं काचिदिहासीना मां दृष्ट्वा सहसा गता ॥

15. त्रेतायुगं * * * तद्धि न मैथिली सा रामस्य रागपदवी मृदु चास्य चेतः।
लब्धा जनस्तु यदि रावणमस्य कार्यं मोक्तुस्य तत्र तिलशो न विदेहिसिगामी ॥

APPENDIX IV.

SPLIT-UP VERSES.

(a) One speaker :

(1) अविमारकः—उरः स्तनतटालसं नयनभारखिन्ना तनुः
धात्री—अम्मो विप्पलवदि ।
अविमारकः—मुखं नयनवल्लभं प्रकृतिताम्रबिम्बाधरम् ।
धात्री—धण्णो खु सो जणो इमं एवं उम्मादेदि ।
अविमारकः—भवेऽपि यदि तादृश नयनपात्रमेयं वपुः
धात्री—सुत्थिदं कय्यं ।
अविमारकः—कथन्नु सुरतान्तरप्रचुरविभ्रमं तद् भवेत् ॥

(*Avi*, II. 6)

(2) सूत्रधारः—बाढम् ।
पुरुषं प्रेषयिष्यामि व्यक्तमात्महिते श्रमम् ।
(नेपथ्ये)
सालक ! सज्जस्त्वम् ।
सूत्रधारः—पुरुषं प्रेषयत्येष यथा यौगन्धरायणः ॥

(*Pratijñā*, I. 2)

Also, *Avi*, III. 14 ; *Pañc*, II. 37.

(b) Two speakers :

(3) दामोदरः—(चाणूरं निहत्य) भग्नास्थिरेष निहतो
सङ्कर्षणः— निहतो मयापि ।
दामोदरः—कंसासुरं च यमलोकमहं नयामि ॥

(*Bāl*, V. 10)

(4) राजा—अपूर्व इव ते हर्षो मृदि केनासि विस्मितः ।
भटः—अश्रद्धेयं प्रियं प्राप्तं सौम्यो ग्रहण गतः ॥

(*Pañc*, II. 34)

(5) धृतराष्ट्रः—वाम्येव सज्जनधनानि तपोवनानि पुत्रप्रणाशविफलं हि धिगस्तु राज्यम् ।
अश्वत्थामा—यातोऽस्त सौम्यिकवधोपतबाणपाणिः गां पातु नो नरपतिः शमितारिपक्षः ॥

(*Ūru*, St. 66)

Similarly, *Prat*, VII. 14; *Avi*, VI. 21.

(6) भरतः— ..... तदुच्यतां
पितुर्मे को व्याधिः
सूतः— हृदयपरितापः खलु महान्
भरतः—किमाहुस्तं वैद्याः
सूतः— न खलु भिषजस्तत्र निपुणाः ।
भरतः—किमाहारं भुङ्क्ते शयनमपि
सूतः— भूमौ निरशनः
भरतः—किमाशा स्याद्
सूतः— दैवं
भरतः— स्फुरति हृदयं वाहय रथम् ॥

(*Prat*, III. 1)

For split-up verses used by two speakers, cf. also, *Prat*, I. 31; III. 14; IV. 24.

(c) Three speakers:

(7) प्रथमः—एष गाढप्रहारशिथिलीकृताङ्गं निपतितं भीमसेनं दृष्ट्वा,
एकाग्राङ्गुलिधारितोन्नतमुखो व्यासः स्थितो विस्मितः ।
द्वितीयः—दैन्यं याति युधिष्ठिरोऽत्र विदुरो बाष्पाकुलाक्षः स्थितः ॥
तृतीयः—स्पृष्टं गाण्डिवमर्जुनेन गगनं कृष्णः समुद्वीक्षते ।
सर्वे—शिष्यप्रीतितया हलं भ्रमयते रामो रणप्रेक्षकः ॥

(*Ūru*, St. 21)

(8) प्रथमः—इक्ष्वाकुवंशविपुलोज्ज्वलदीपकेतोः
द्वितीयः—रामस्य रावणवधाय कृतोद्यमस्य ।
तृतीयः—संग्रामदर्शनकुतूहलबद्धचित्ताः
सर्वे—प्राप्ता वयं हिमवतः शिखरात् प्रतूर्णम् ॥

Also, *Abh*, VI. 5; one MS. however, assigns this verse to सर्वे and not as above (*Abh*. Lahore Edn, p. 69, n5)

(d) Four speakers:

(9) द्रोणः—तस्मान्मे रथमानयन्तु पुरुषाः,
शकुनिः— हस्ती समानीयताम्,
कर्णः—भारार्थं भूशमुष्टतैरिह हयैर्युक्तो रथः स्थाप्यताम् ।
भीष्मः—बुद्धिर्मे स्मरते विराटनगरं गन्तुं धनुस्सज्जतां
सर्वे—मुक्त्वा चापमिहैव तिष्ठतु भवानाज्ञाविधेया वयम् ॥

(*Pañc*, I. 57)

APPENDIX V.

REFERENCES TO BHĀSA AND HIS WORKS

In Chapters II, III, IV and VI, we have already quoted many references to Bhāsa including Nos. 1–18, 20–23 and 25 as given by Prof. Devadhar in App. C (pp. 573-577) to his *Bhāsanāṭakacakra*. Nos. 19 and 24 from Prof. Devadhar's list appear below as Nos. 4 and 11. Much doubt has been expressed as to the genuineness of the references given by S. Narayana Sastri from *Kavihṛdaya*, (alleged to be a work of Dandin) and *Kāvyānuśāsana*, (alleged to be a commentary on *Kavihṛdaya* by Hemacandra), as MSS of these works have not yet been discovered or even known; these references occur as Nos. 3, 9 and 12 in this Appendix, and we have taken them from Pt. R. V. Krishnamachariar's *Bhūmikā* to the *Priyadarśikā* (pp. xxii-xxiii, xxvi). No. 1 below is from *Abhinavabhāratī* (*Nāṭyaśāstra*, Vol. 1, pp. 251-252, GOS) where the Editor of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, proposes मासो for हासो, and Dr. Stein (*IHQ*, XIV, pp. 638-639) and Prof. Kane (*PCV*, p. 394) approve of the emendation. The next quotation is from *Kumārapālapratibodha* (p. 81, GOS), No. 5 is from the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa* (p. 53, GOS), and No. 6 has been taken from Dr. Keith's *History of Sanskrit Literature* (p. 336) where he states it to be from *Udayasundarikathā* of Soḍḍhala. *Sarasvatikaṇṭhābharaṇa*...(*Kāvyamālā*, p. 215) supplies us with the next quotation, and the following one, alleged by S. Narayana Sastri to be from *Kavivimarśa* of Rājaśekhara (cf. Krishnamachariar, *Priyadarśikā*, *Bhūmikā*, pp. xxi-xxii, xxv-xvvi) occurs in the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* (No. 188, p. 30, Bom. Sanskrit Series, No. XXXVII). For No. 10, we are indebted to Prof. P. K. Gode, Curator, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, who supplied this, the only inscriptional reference to Bhāsa, so far available. As stated by Prof. Gode, it occurs on p. 28, Archæological Survey of India, No. 5, 1876—Inscriptions from Kathiawad and Kutch.

(1) (यदाह श्रीहर्षः—) अत एव हा (मा?) सो नाम (कविः) कस्मिंश्चिन्नाटके "दिवं यातश्चित्तज्वरेण कलिरित एवाभिवर्तते। अशक्यमस्य पुरतोऽवस्थातु" मित्यादि।

(2) उदयणस्स जोगन्धराएणो अमच्चो, सो णिअ-पहु-मोआवणत्थं उम्मत्तगवेसणं पदर्द—

यदि तां चैव तां चैव तां चैवायतलोचनाम्।
न हरामि नृपस्यार्थे नाहं यौगन्धरायणः॥

The verse occurs in the Pratijñā.

(3) कुर्युर्नः कवयः कवित्वकलमप्राचीनबीजाङ्कुरक्षेत्राणि
प्रथितप्रभाः शुभमतिं श्रीभासबाणादयः ।

(4) 'कुण सङ्कोचने' चुरादिर्दीर्घादिरिति धातुप्रदीपः । तथा च 'कूणं बाहुयुग' मिति भासकविः ।

(5) ततो दैवायत्तफले दरिद्रचारुदत्तादिरूपके पुरुषव्यापारस्य गौणत्वात् कथं प्रारम्भादयः स्युः ? न, तत्रापि नायकस्य फलार्थित्वात्, फलस्य च प्रारम्भादिनान्तरीयकत्वात् ।

(6) बभूवुरन्येऽपि कुमारदासभासादयो ह्यन्त कवीन्द्रवस्ते ।
यदीय गोभिः कृतिनां द्रवन्ति चेतांसि चन्द्रोपलनिर्मलानि ॥

(7) भासश्चापि भासादौ कविवर्गे जगत्त्रयीम् ।
के न यान्ति निबन्धारः कालिदासस्य दासताम् ॥

(8) भासो रामिलसौमिलौ वररुचिः श्रीसाहसाङ्कः कवि
मेण्ठोभारविकालिदासतरलाः स्कन्धः सुबन्धुश्च यः ।
दण्डी बाणदिवाकरौ गणपतिः कान्तश्च रत्नाकरः
सिद्धा यस्य सरस्वती भगवती के तस्य सर्वे वयम् ॥

(9) वाल्मीकिव्यासभासप्रभृतिभिरुदितां कालिदासाख्यकाव्यैर्मुक्तां च बाणप्रभृतिभिरनघां साहितीसौहितीं ताम् ॥

(10) व्यासंव्यातनुतां विरोचनसुतस्त्यागं कवित्वश्रियं
भासव्यासपुरस्सरा पृथुरुचिप्राप्ताश्च वीरव्रतम् ।
प्रज्ञां नाकिपताकिनी गुरुरपि श्रीवस्तुपालध्रुवं
जानीमो न विवेकमेकमकृतोत्सेकं तु कौतस्कुतम् ॥

(11) शौनकमिव बन्धुमती कुमारमविमारकं कुरङ्गीव ।
अर्हति कीर्तिमतीयं कान्तं कल्याणवर्माणम् ॥

(12) सम्प्रति धरां काष्ठाग्निरूढेनापि भासेन भूतपूर्वा स्वकीया दशा न विस्मृता । यतोऽनेन पूर्वाचरितं षटकर्परेणोदकवहनमेव प्रतिज्ञातम् । प्रतिज्ञां चेमामसहमानाः परे कवयः परिहसितुमनसो विक्रमार्कसभ्यमेनं भासं तज्जातिस्मारकेन षटकर्परनाम्ना व्यवजहुः । क्रमेण च स एव व्यपदेशो भासमहाकवेः सुप्रसिद्धः सम्पन्नः ।

INDEX

Āam, 127
Abenteuer des Knaben Krischna, Die, 75n, 86n; see also *Bālacarita* (weller).
Abhimanyu 10, 43, 85f, 192, 204ff, 227, 329, 411.
Abhinavabhāratī, 45.
Abhinavagupta, 22, 25ff, 33f, 45f, 70, 131, 138n, 166f, 220, 277n, 311.
Abhiṣeka, 2ff, 22, 24n, 41f, 46ff, 51, 53, 57, 83f; sources 87, 95f, 100, 109, 111, 116, 118; table 119, 131f, 125, 135, 143f, 148ff, 201; title 212; plot 212-217; deviations 217; type 217-218; sentiments 218-219, critical remarks 219-221, 227, 229, 263f, 276, 301n, 348n, 383n, 389ff, 396, 398n ff, 405, 412n, 414n, 427n, 433, 434n, 463, 464n f.
Abhiṣeka (Annamalai University Journal), 52n
Abhiṣeka (Ed. Venkatarama Sarma), 44n, 47n, 111n.
Abhyankar, Prof. K. V., 1.
Abkari, 438, 448.
Abrus precatorius, 449.
Achan, P. Anujan, 38n.
Acharya, Dr. P. K., 137n, 138, 387, 417, 418n.
Acquiluria Agallocha, 466.
Adam's Bridge, 336.
Adbhuta, 93, 187, 203, 218, 226, 238, 273.
ādhaka, 450.
āḍhatta, 448n.
āḍhya, 45.
Afghanistan, 326, 331.
Agastya, 104, 234, 441.
Agastyakūṭa, 347.
Agate, 446.
Agni, 217ff, 237, 425f, 445; in human form 42.
Agnimitra, 309.
Agniṣṭoma, 189.
agre, 383 also n.
Agriculture, 448.
Aguru, 389, 466.
ahak$_e$, 158.
Ahamkāra, 432.
Ahicchatra, 341.
Ailas, 332.
Ain, 466.
Aitareya, 84; –*Āraṇyaka*, 336; –*Brāhmaṇa*, 203, 326, 332, 337.
Aiyangar, Dr. S. Krishnaswami, 317n.
Aja, 245f, 420.
Ajātaśatru, 325, 327, 330, 334, 342ff, 401.
Ajjaka, 306n.
Ākāśabhāṣita, 7, 103, 188.
Ākāśagaṅgā, 347.
Ākhyāna, 176.
Akṣa, 8, 214.
Ākṣepa, 302.
Alamkāras, 93, 107, 218.
Alberuni, 339.
Alexander the Great, 409.
Allahabad, 337, 341; –High Court, 375.

Almora, 348.
Aloewood, 466.
Alstonia Scholaris, 467.
Alwar, 334.
āma, 17, 158.
Āmaka smaśāna, 469.
Amarakośaṭīkāsarvasva, 25, 29.
Amateur Drama Conference, 106n. 382n.
Ambapālī, 442.
Ambarīṣa, 210.
Ambassadors, 405f.
Amin, 329.
amitrabala, 408.
Amraoti, 333.
Amṛtadatta, 112.
Amṛtāṅka nāṭaka, 298.
Amulets, 444.
Anachronisms, 100-102.
ānaddha, 423.
anadhyāya, 363.
Anagandi, 341.
Ānanda, 146n
Anaṅga Harṣa, 288.
Ancestor Worship, 421f.
Ancient India (Rapson), 339n.
Ancient India (Strabo), 469n.
Ancient Indian Numismatics, 450n.
Āndhras, 306, 332f.
Aṅga, 67, 322, 323-324, 334, 337.
Aṅgada, 213, 218.
Aṅgāravatī, 285f.
Aṅgula, 449f.
Aṅgulīyaka, 48, –kathā, 238.
Aṅguttara Nikāya, 323n.
Animal food, 436f.
Aniruddha, 432.
Aṅka, 134, 180, 182, 184, 192.
Annals of the state, 414.
Annamalai, 347.
antaḥpura, 382, 397.
Antelope, 251.
aṇṭhi, 52, 157.
Anthology Verses, 111-117.
anubhāva, 92, 183.
Anujñā, 287.
Anuloma marriages, 358, 366, 372f, 376.
Anumānālaṁkāra, 93, 258, 274, 287f, 301.
Anupālaka, 325.
Anyokti, 302.
Apahnuti, 287.
āpaṇa, 447.
āpānaka, 441.
Aparājitā, 426.
Āpastamba, 67, 367, 368n, 421.
āpas tāvat, 148.
Apaya, 328.
Aprastutaprasaṁsā, 210, 218, 259, 273f, 288, 302.
Apratihata, 426.
Apsarasas, 179, 213, 219.
Apte, Prof. R. N. 75n.
apūpa, 436.
Arabhaṭī, 187, 194, 200, 210.
Āraṇyakas, 432.
aratni, 449.
Araṭṭa, 411.
Aravinda, 465.
ārbhava stotra, 471.
Arbitration, 447.
Arch, 418.
Archaisms, 66.
Architecture, Sculpture and Art, 417-423; Arch. civil and domestic 417, –in Buddhist Age, 418–419, –in Vedic, Indus and Epic periods, 417–418; in Bhāsa 419.
Ardhamāgadhī, 126n.
Ardhanārīśvara, 428.
arghya, 226, 468.
argumentum ex silentio, 78-80.
arhatship, 431.
Ariel, 188.
Ariṣṭarṣabha, 6, 224, 227.
Aristotle, 129, 132.
Arjuna, 9, 68, 85f, 189, 192f, 199, 204, 207f, 210, 329, 465f.
Arjuna (demon), 223.
Armour, 410f, 414ff.
Armoury, 389.
Army, kinds of 408; army register 412.
Arrows 410f, 447; arrowbags 410.
Ārṣa, 367, 369, 371.
Arthadyotanikā, 67n, 110.
Arthāntaranyāsa, 93, 210, 239, 258f, 273f, 287f, 302.
arthaprakṛti, 183.
Arthaśāstra (Bṛhaspati), 63ff, 250, 356n.

Arthaśāstra (Kauṭilya), 1, 64, 68, 72, 76-78, 100f, 109, 169f, 211, 264, 308, 310, 316, 319ff, 351, 353n, 356ff, 372, 381f, 385f, 388ff, 396ff, 403ff, 426, 429, 431, 435n, 438, 443f, 448ff, 452, 454f, 457n, 459n, 461f, 470f.
Arthaśṛṅgāra, 29.
Arthavyakti, 92n.
Artificial elephant, 422.
Arts and Crafts, 423.
Aruṇā, 328.
Arundhati, 252.
Āruṇi, 278, 284, 286, 289, 292, 404, 407n.
Āryā, 454f; Ārya, 143ff.
Āryabhaṭṭa, 343.
Āryaka, 20, 164, 173, 299, 304ff, 325.
Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa, 271n.
Āryaputra, 5, 19, 66.
Ārya Revā, 242.
Āryāvarta, 339.
Asana, 466.
āsandaka, 419.
āsandī, 419.
Āsandivat, 329, 346.
āsava, 439.
Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi, 25n f, 38, 45, 48ff, 52n, 56n, 57f, 77n, 83, 125, 135, 149, 275n, 377n.
asi, 328, 414n, 416.
Asitotpala, 465.
asiyaṣṭi, 416.
Aśmaka, 332f.
Asna, 466.
Aśoka, 78, 214, 216, 339f, 345, 427, 465f.
Aśokavanikā, 48, 390.
āśramas, 143, 359ff.
āśramadharma, 327.
Assembly of Ministers, 404.
Asses, 442f, 445.
aṣṭami, 159, 295, 362.
asthi, 157.
astras, 189.
Astrologer, 404, 413, 445.
Astrology, 168.
Astronomy and Astrology 434.,
Āsura, 367, 369, 372f, 466.
Asuras, 421.
Asuri, Anantacharya, 1, 97n.
Asutosh Memorial Volume, 21n, 51n, 60n, 63n, 72n, 75n, 77n, 79n, 100n f, 105n, 108n f, 112n, 155n, 167n ff, 277n, 354n, 461n.
Aśvādhyakṣa, 411.
Aśvaghoṣa, 75, 80, 112, 123f, 127, 145, 160, 275.
Aśvamedha, 327, 436.
Aśvapati (Kekaya), 345.
Aśvarathanadī (=Aśvanadī), 328.
Aśvatthāman, 199, 329, 461.
Aśvins, 411, 424.
aṭavībala, 408.
Atharvaveda, 177, 179, 323, 327, 330ff, 398n, 468.
Atiśayokti, 74n, 204, 288, 301.
ativyāpti, 38.
Audārya, 92n.
audghāṭima, 415.
Aufrecht, Th., 351.
Aupamanyava (Kāmboja), 326.
Aurangabad, 331.
Auśanas, 404.
Avadātikā, 242.
avaguṇṭhana, 68, 386.
Avanti, 67, 73, 88, 265, 271, 322ff, 331, 337, 339, 340-341, 375, 402, 406, 422, 452.
Āvantikā, 27n, 28, 281, 285.
Avantisundarikathā, 43, 51, 54, 76n, 110n.
Avasathagāras, 388.
avasthā, 183.
Aviary, 393.
avidhavākaraṇa, 280.
Avimāraka, 62, 67, 89f, 94, 103, 113, 141, 229, 231ff, 240, 373ff, 407, 441n, 444, 472.
Avimāraka, 2f, 5ff, 12ff, 33n, 35n, 41ff; 45, 51, 54f, 57, 62, 68, 80, 83f; sources 89; 92ff, 102f, 105, 109, 114f, 118; table 119, 121, 130f, 135f, 138f, staging of the third Act, 140-141; 144, 146ff, 150, 154, 169 227, title, 229; plot 229-237; deviations, 237-238; type 238; sentiments 238-239; critical remarks, 239-241; 276n, 301n, 307, 309n, 328, 345, 347, 353n f, 356, 358n, 363n, 365n, 373n ff. 379n,

381n ff, 390ff, 396ff, 403n, 405n ff, 423n, 426n, 428n, 431n, 434n f, 441n, 444n f, 458n, 463ff, 468n, 471n f.
Avimāraka, Schauspiel von Bhāsa, 89n.
Avimāraka (Shama'a), 52n.
axes, 414.
āyam, 127.
ayana, 450.
Ayodhyā, 9, 95, 241, 243ff, 247, 249, 251, 254f, 257f, 263, 323, 330, 339-340, 418, 421, 439.
āyudhāgāra, 397.
Babylon, 443, 447.
Bacchic Songs, 269, 276.
Bādarāyaṇa, 16.
Badari, 339.
Badarikāśrama, 347f.
Bahmaārt, 429.
Bahuvṛihi, 97.
Baibhara hill, 344.
Bairat, 345.
Bakula, 435, 465.
Bālacarita, 2f, 5ff, 11ff, 20, 24, 33n, 41f, 51, 57, 73ff, 83f, sources 86-87; 90, 94, 96, 100, 102, 109, 111, 113, table 119; 121f, 126, 137, staging of fifth Act, 142-143; 148, 150, 154, 188, 217, 220, title 221; plot 221-226; deviations 226; type 226; sentiments 226-227; critical remarks 227-228; 261, 307, 309n, 354n f, 357n f, 378n, 387, 389, 394f, 401n, 414n, 426n f, 434, 441n, 444n f, 463f, 470f.
Bālacarita, (QJMS), 52n.
Bālacarita (Weller), 126n, 226n, 308n, See also *Abenteuer des Knaben Krischna*.
Baladeva, 426.
Balāki, 223.
balance, 449.
Balarāma, 86, 133, 195f, 199, 426f, 432.
balconies, 417.
bali, 430.
Balibandhana, 178.
Balkh, 345.
Bamsi, 346f.
Bāṇa, 2, 5n, 36 ff, 47, 50 f, 57, 61, 70, 91, 97f, 173, 310.
Bāṇagaṅgā, 344.
Banda, 337.
Bandhujīva, 467.
Banerjea, Dr. P. N., 352n, 398n, 403n, 413, 461.
Banerji-Sastri, Dr. A. P., 1, 4, 6n, 40, 42 f, 61n, 64n, 72n, 77n, 78, 97n, 123, 126n, 129, 131n, 155, 241n, 272.
Banka, 346.
Bankipur, 343.
bappa, 158.
Baranasi, 327f.
Bards, 413.
Bārhadrathapura, 344.
Bārhaspatyas, 404.
Bark-garments, 10, 247, 252, 302.
Barley, 436ff.
Barna, 328.
Barnett, Dr. L. D., 2, 5, 21, 23n, 24, 38n, 56, 61n, 64, 69n, 89, 97n, 98, 110, 124n, 125, 126n, 128, 156, 176n, 290.
Baroda State, 348.
Barringtonia Acutangula, 466.
Basak, Dr. R. G., 456n f.
Bāspotsṛṣṭikāṅka, 200.
Bassia Latifolia, 466.
Baston, A., 1.
bathroom, 417.
battles, battlefields, 15, 95.
Baudhāyana, 67, 339, 367f, 376, 382n.
Baudhāyana Sūtra, 332n.
Baveru, 447.
beads, 450.
Beating of the drum, 402f.
bedsteads, 417, 419.
beef, 437.
Behistun, 331.
Bellary, 341.
Belvalkar, Dr. S. K., 1, 76n, 151, 155f, 158, 163, 171.
Benares, 311, 324, 327, 333, 336, 438, 447.
Benfey, Dr. T., 351.
Bhaddapīṭham, 419.
Bhadramukha, 102.
Bhadrāśvavarṣa, 348.

Bhadrāvati, 269.
Bhagalpore, 323, 346.
Bhagavadajjukīya, 38, 57n f, 64n, 125, 149.
Bhagavadgītā, 431, 433.
Bhagavan, 206f.
Bhāgavata Purāṇa, 86.
Bhagavatism, 431.
Bhagavatisūtra, 323n.
Bhagavanlal Indraji, 339.
bhaktadāsa, 453.
Bhallaṭa 112; - *Śataka*, 112.
Bhāmaha, 72f, 275.
Bhāṇa, 180, def n, 181.
Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, 151n.
Bhandarkar, Dr. D. R., 61n f, 63, 69n, 77, 101n, 108, 292, 306, 319f, 326ff, 337n ff, 342n, 349n, 427n, 450.
Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 83, 84n
Bhandarkar, Sir R. G. 66, 86n, 126n.
bhāra, 188.
Bharata, 19n, 46, 53, 87, 95, 143, 217, 241, 243ff, 252ff, 262, 340, 429.
Bharata (of *Nāṭyaśāstra*), 129ff, 179, 308, 310, 433.
Bharatakathā, 257.
Bharatanāṭyavedavivṛti, 166.
Bharatarohaka, 270.
Bharatavākyas, 49, 68-69, 80,98-100, 109, 118, 131, 134, 150f, 155, 157, 193ff, 202, 286.
Bhāratavarṣa, 348.
Bhāratavarṣīya Prācīna Caritra-kośa, 426n.
Bharata war, 384.
Bhāratiya Nāṭyaśāstra (Poona), 130n, 137n, 139n f.
Bharatpur, 334, 338.
Bharhut, 337.
Bhartṛdāraka, 102.
Bhāsa and the authorship of Thirteen Trivandrum Plays, 152n, 155n, 164n, 468n f.
Bhāṣa, 104.
Bhāsa, Anachronisms in, 100-102; - and Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*; 129-132; - and Kālidāsa, 75-76; - and Kauṭilya, 70-71; - and *Kundamālā*, 70-71; - and Śūdraka, 76; Authorship and authenticity, 1-62; Causes of neglect, 307-310; Date, 63-81; Defects, 102-104; friend of fire, 42; Influence, 146-149; King (?), 105; laughter of poetry, 43; Magic in Bhāsa, 135-137; -MSS, 31, 39, 47, 83f, 110f, 125, 216f, 310f; Metrics, 143-146; Other Works, 106-111; Personal history, 104-106; Prakrit, 122-128; Southerner (?), 105; Stage, 137-143; - reform, 40; Tragic in Bhāsa, 132-135; Traits, 219, 276; Verses, 44-47, App.
Bhāsa's Prakrit (Printz), 126n.
Bhāsa's Works : A Critical Study See *Critical Study*.
Bhāsa's Works : A Criticism See *Criticism*.
Bhāsa-Studien, 3n f, 33n, 40n, 97n, 129n.
Bhāskaranandin, 169, 460.
Bhāsvara, 183.
Bhaṭa, 7.
Bhattacharya, MM. Dr. Vidhusekhara, 354n.
Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa, 91, 134, 145, 200.
Bhattanatha Swami, See Swami Bhattanatha.
Bhau Daji, 336.
bhāva, 183.
Bhavabhūti, 3, 21, 35n, 91, 145, 147f, 241, 263.
Bhāvaprakāśa (-*ṇa*), 25ff, 96n f, 182f, 186, 194n, 238n, 300.
Bhayānaka, 203, 218, 226, 238.
Bhedavīra, 273.
Bhide, Prof. H. B., 1, 5, 61n f, 67n, 69, 155, 168n, 339n, 434.
Bhikkhus, 360.
Bhikṣus, 430.
Bhilsa, 333.
Bhīma, 10, 18, 43, 84f, 133f, 136, 154, 195f, 200ff, 206ff, 212, 266.
Bhīma (Vidarbha), 332.
bhiṇḍipāla, 414n, 415.
Bhiṣma, 129, 184, 186, 205ff, 208ff, 212, 354, 468.
Bhojas, 332.

Bhojadeva, 25, 27, 33, 70, 114.
bhṛtaka, 408.
Bhujaṅgaprayāta, 144.
Bhūrja, 470.
Bhūtika, 230ff, 236f.
bhūtas, 430.
Bias, 345.
Bibhīṣana, 8, 212, 214ff, 220, 253, 255.
Bible, 339.
Bijnor, 346.
Bika, 421, Bikaner 421.
Bilaspur, 329.
Bimbisāra (Seniya), 271n, 324f, 331, 334, 344, 401.
Birbhum, 323.
Birdwood, Sir George, 323.
blanket, 446.
Bloch, Dr. J., 180.
Boats, 443, 446.
Bodhāyana, 38.
Bodhisatva, 355, 398.
Bombay Presidency, 339.
boomerangs, 414.
bow, 414.
Brahmā, 426.
Brāhma, 367, 369, 371, 373, 376.
Brahmacārī, 360, 426.
Brahmacarya, 360f, 380, 382.
Brahmadatta, 109, 324, 327.
Brahmadatta, (Culani), 341.
Brahmaloka, 221.
Brāhmaṇas, 177, 351, 355, 423f, 468.
Brāhmaṇas, 18, 177, 179, 318f, 350ff, 362, 369, 377, 382, 389, 403, 406, 413, 421, 437ff, 445, 455.
Brāhmaṇī, 173f.
Brahma Purāṇa, 54, 259.
Brahmaputrā, 336.
Brahmavaddhana, 328.
Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, 66, 355, 437.
Bṛhadratha, 333.
Bṛhannalā, 43, 207, 209f, 212, 382n.
Bṛhaspati, 78, 250, 396.
Bṛhatkathā, 73, 87f, 168, 237, 264, 270, 286, 289f, 305, 308.
Bṛhatkathāmañjarī, 87f, 264n, 288.
Bṛhatkathāślokasaṁgraha, 168, 264n, 286, 288.
brick, use of 417.
Broach, 338.
Brown, C. J., 450n.
Brunetiere, 91.
bucklers, 415.
Bucolic scenes, 13.
Budaon, 341.
Budhasvāmī, 286.
Buddhacarita 75.
Buddhist Age, Architecture in, 419f; attitude towards women, 380f; caste-system, 380f, 385; conveyances, 442f; festivals, 440; food, 437f; funerary customs, 469; gambling, 457; marriage, 370f; prostitution, 459; religion, 426, 430f; sculpture, 420; slavery, 453; trade, 447f; urban and rural life, 388.
Buddhist India, 318n, 322n, 325n f, 339n f, 342n, 359n, 364n, 388n.
Buffaloes, 436.
Bühler, Dr. G., 63, 317.
bullocks, 436f, 441ff.
Burials, cremation, 469; fractional, 469.
Butea Frondosa, 466.
butter, 437.
Cabinet, 404.
Caityas, 431.
Cakra, 411, 414f.
Cākyār, 55, 58ff, 98, 108f, 195, 308f.
Calayantra, 415.
Cambal, 345.
Cambay, 339.
Cambridge History of India, Vol. 62n, 77n, 80n, 100n, 320n, 352n, 391n, 438n, 456n.
Camels, 441ff, 445.
Campā(city), 324, 337; (River) 323f.
Campaka, 465, 467.
Campanagara, 324.
Campapura, 324.
Cāṇakya, 148, 319f.
Caṇḍabhārgava, 236.
Caṇḍakauśika, 136.

Cāṇḍālas, 236, 353, 358, 366, 388f, 391, 395n, 445; Cāṇḍāla women 223.
Candanadāsa, 148.
Candragupta (Maurya), 62, 69, 77, 79f, 100, 319, 372, 431, 460.
Cāṅgerikā, 435, 467.
cannon, 409.
Cāṇūra, 6, 143, 225, 344, 470.
Cape Comorin, 347.
Capparis Zeylanica, 467.
caravans, 442, 445ff.
Cardamum, 336, 347.
carma, 416.
Carmaṇvatī, 328.
Carmichael Lectures 1918, 62n, 69n, 292n, 306n, 322ff, 337ff, 342, 349.
Carnelian, 446.
Carpentry, 416.
Carriages, diff. kinds of, in Bhāsa, 444.
Carts, 446f.
Cārudatta, 62, 142, 151f, 155, 160, 164, 171ff, 293ff, 300, 302ff, 307n, 359n, 373, 377, 379, 392, 394n, 422, 430, 444, 458, 472.
Cārudatta, 2ff, 9, 11, 13ff, 17f, 20f, 24, 33n, 41, 43, 45, 51f, 54, 62f, 68n, 70ff, 76, 84, sources 88; 90, 96, 100, 101, 103, 105, 109f, 113f, 118, table 119; 120, 122, 126n, 139, staging of third and fourth Acts 141-142; 144, 146ff, authorship 150-151; fragment (?) 151-154; relation with *Mṛcchakaṭika* 155-165; vocabulary 157; technique 157-158; Prakrit, 158; versification 158-159; dramatic incident 159-160; problem examined 160-163; additions 163-164; different recensions (?) 166-167; differences 167-170; not an abridgment 170-171; contrary views 172-174; 180, 184, 238, 241, title 293; plot 294-298; deviations 298-299; type 299-300; sentiments 300-302; critical study 302-307; 309n, 353n ff, 357n ff, 362nf, 378, 379n, 382n, 384n, 386n, 390n ff, 422, 423n, 430f, 438n f, 441n, 443n, 444, 448n, 452n, 455n, 458n f, 461, 470, 472n.
Castes, their relations and Occupations, 350-358.
Caturaṅga, 408.
Caturasra, 138.
Caturbhāṣī, 38, 51, 76n, 149.
Caturdaśī, 355.
Cāturmāsya, 410.
Causes of neglect of Bhāsa's Works, 307-310.
Cavalry, 408, 411, 414.
Cedi, 341.
Ceṭa, 173, 238.
Ceṭī, 151, 235, 238.
Ceylon, 78, 336, 345f, 443.
Chairs, 393, 417, 419.
Chakladar, Prof. H. C., 241n, 342n, 364n, 374n, 377n f, 382n f, 393n f, 397n, 423n, 439n, 441n, 460n.
Chakrabortty, Dr. S. K. 450n.
Chakravarti, C. 131n.
Chalcolithic age 446.
Chamberlain 401.
Chambers, Dr. 132.
Chanda, R. P. 468n f.
Chāndogya Upaniṣad 331n.
Chandoracanā 146n.
Chandur 333.
Chaphekar, Prof. S. N. 241n.
Charioteer 413f.
Chariots, 408f, 411f, 414, 441ff, 446; chariot-racing 440.
Charpentier, Dr. J. 1f, 129, 152, 155, 163f, 171, 176n, 299, 304 ff.
Charsadda 331.
Chattopadhyaya, Prof. K. 75n, 124n.
Chaudhury, P. 61n, 99.
Chengannur 2.
Chera king 53.
Chess board 393.
Childe, Prof. V. Gordon., 317n.
Child marriages, 378.
China Rose, 467.
Chinaub, 335.
Chitaldrug, 332.
Chitrav, Siddheshvara Shastri,

426n.
chivia, 158.
chowrie, 402.
chronological order of the Bhāsa plays, 118-122.
Chronology of Ancient India, 325n, 338n, 364n, 471n.
Cilappadikāram 73.
Cities and houses &c. in Vedic, Indus, Epic, Buddhist, and Mauryan periods, 387-389; –in Bhāsa 389–391.
'Citizens of the World' 304.
citraphalaka, 423.
Citrus Medica Var Acida, 466.
Citybred gentleman, dress of, 439.
cityguards, 232, 239, 389.
City, laying out of, 388-389.
Clark, Dr. W. E. 125, 127.
Clubs, 410f.
coats of mail, 414.
Coimbatore, 347.
coined money, 451.
Coins of India, 450n.
Cola, 309.
Collyrium, 383.
column, 418.
Commander-in-Chief, 404, 414.
Common Flowering Plants of Western India, 465n.
constellation, 375.
contracts, 445.
Conveyances, 441-444; –in Vedic Age 441-442; in epic period 442; –in Buddhist age 442-443; –in *Arthaśāstra* 443; –in Bhāsa 443-444
cooks, 393.
Coorg, 334.
copper, 451.
Cora, a poet, 43.
corals, 446.
Coronation ceremony, 402.
Corporate life in Ancient India, 351n f, 398n.
couches, 319, 417, 419.
courtesans, 390, 422–423.
court-life, 239.
courtyard, 393, 417, 419.
cow, 426, 436f, 442, 450.
Cowell, E. B. 319n.
Cowell and Thomas, 37.
cowherds, 13, 394-395, 441, 471.
cowries, 450.
creditors, 448.
cremation, 468f; -grounds 389, 391.
Crescent-on-the-Hill, 452.
Crimean War, 409.
Critical Study (Bhāsa's Works: A Critical Study) 2n, 4n, 17n, 19n, 23n f, 26n, 29n, 32n, 34n, 53n f, 57n, 63n, 66n, 69n, 72n, 74n, 76n f, 80n, 91n, 97n f, 100n, 108n, 126n, 166n, 240n, 307n, 320n.
Criticism (Bhāsa's Works: A Criticism), 5n, 19n, 23n, 26n, 29n, 35n, 38n, 48n, 53n, 83n, 97n, 124n, 152n, 164n, 172n.
crown, 402.
cubic measures, 449.
Cūḍāmaṇi, 48.
Cudgels,
Cukā, 467.
Cunningham, Sir A. 326n f, 329f, 333n, 335n ff.
curds, 437.
Curfew order, 391.
Curse, 223, 227, 444; - of a Brāhmaṇa 354.
curtains, 419.
customs, 407.
Cūta, 465.
Cutch, 338.
Dadhivāhana, 337.
dahim, 438.
Daiva, 367, 369, 371.
Dakhinabades, 332.
dakṣiṇā, 205, 294, 301, 355, 363, 382; - *padā* 332.
Dakṣiṇāpatha, 323, 332-333.
Dāmaka Prahasanam 3n, 38, 58, 108f, 149, 224.
Dāmodara, 74, 143, 224f, 227, 441n.
Dāmodaragupta, 74n.
dāna, 310, 400.
dance, 440; dancing 459.
daṇḍa, 450.
daṇḍādasa, 453.
Daṇḍaka, 16, 144, 146, 148, 255, 332, 345.
Daṇḍakāraṇya, 331.
daṇḍāsana, 415.

Daṇḍin, 20, 33, 43f, 47, 51, 54f, 70, 112, 150.
Dantapuranagara, 333.
darbha, 250, 402, 413.
Daridra Cārudatta, 30, 150, 153f, 163, 166.
Darius, 331.
darkness, 96.
Darśaka, 62, 88, 280, 284, 337, 342, 364, 373.
Dāruparvata (-ka), 14, 214, 233.
Das, Dr. A. C., 316n, 408, 414n, 446n, 458n.
dāsa, 350, 366, 452ff.
Daśaratha, 6, 12, 18, 70, 74n, 87, 241, 243f, 246, 248f, 253, 255ff, 261f, 373, 375, 398.
Daśaratha Jātaka, 428n.
Daśārṇa, 333.
Daśarūpa, 180n, 182, 186, 190, 194, 200n, 203, 209, 272, 300n.
Das Gupta, Dr. S. N., 175n.
dāsis, 453.
dasyu, 350, 366, 452f.
date, 437.
Dathāva^{m}*sa*, 336.
dātrima, 453.
Dattātreya, 425, 428.
daughters-in-law, 461.
Davids, Dr. T. A. W. Rhys, 318, 322n, 326, 330n, 339f, 342n, 359n, 364, 388n.
Dayāvira, 210.
Death on battlefield praised, 413.
Deb, H. K., 69n, 79n f, 88n, 152n, 292, 306.
debtor, 448.
Defects in Bhāsa, 102-104.
Delhi, 328, 345f.
Deposit, 448, 472.
Description of darkness 15:-of nature 93-96.
devadaṇḍa, 415.
Devaki, 12, 22, 221ff, 226, 228.
Devakula, 41-42.
Devakulika, 19n, 241n, 245.
Devāpi, 398.
Devaratha, 443.
Devavrata, 169.
Devdhar, Prof. C. R., 2 ff, 8n, 13, 18n f, 21, 28, 32n f, 38n, 40n f, 61n, 65n, 92, 97n, 100n f, 115n, 123, 124n, 127n, 152, 155, 158n, 164n, 166n; refutation 171-173; 240, 255n, 257n.
devices on coins, 451.
Devi, 428.
Dey, Nundo Lal, 325, 328, 329n, 332n, 334n ff.
dhakkehi, 158.
Dhammapada, 371.
Dhanañjaya, 186.
dhanu, 414n, 450.
dhanurgaha, 449.
Dhanurmaha, 225, 227, 394, 440.
dhanurmuṣṭi, 449.
Dharaṇa, 449, 451f.
dharma, 220, 400.
Dharmakirti, 336.
Dharmapāla, 452.
Dharmaśāstra (-s) 63, 250, 356, 360f, 370ff, 376, 403, 413.
Dharmasūtras, 366ff.
Dharmavira, 210, 257.
Dharwar, 341.
Dhātriphala, 466.
Dhāvaka, 34ff, 104, 106.
Dhenuka, 224.
Dhīralalita, 287, 299.
Dhīranāga, 70.
Dhīrodātta, 218, 226, 256.
Dholpur, 338.
Dhṛtarāṣṭra, 8, 10, 85f, 185f, 192ff, 370, 464, 468.
Dhṛtarāṣṭra (of Kāśi), 327.
Dhruva, Dewan Bahadur Prof. K. H., 1, 5, 21f, 28, 31ff, 39, 41n, 44ff, 50, 61n, 69, 73, 75n, 83f, 86, 89, 99f, 104, 110, 118, 120, 124, 130n, 145, 150n, 153n, 155, 241, 256n, 257, 263, 273, 306, 434n.
Dhruva, 344.
Dhruvasena, 225.
Dhūmaketu, 236.
Dhūrtila, 130n.
Dhūtā, 163.
dhvajāhṛta, 453.
Dhvanyāloka, 25n; - locana, 166, 277n.
diasheuasis, 161.
dice, 456f.
Digambara, 80, 431.
Dighacārāyaṇa, 330.

Dikshit, Rao Bahadur K. N. 317n.
Dikshitar, Prof. V. R. Ramachandra, 1, 61n, 73, 77n, 80, 317, 320n, 360n, 405n.
Dilipa, 245f, 420.
Dillon, M. 32n, 289n.
Ḍima, 180n, 182.
Dinajpur, 345.
Dinara, 86.
Dinnāga, 70.
Diśākākas, 447.
disanti, 158.
Disappearance of kings, 403.
discs, 414.
Disguises, 406.
dissadi, 158.
Divākara, 36f.
divasa, 450.
Divodāsa, 328.
divorces, 371, 378.
Dog, 426, 445.
Donkeys, 443.
Doorkeeper, 401.
Dowry contract, 246f.
Drainage system, 387ff, 391, 417; drains, underground 388f, 391.
Dramatic entertainment, 402.
dramatis personæ, 16, 19, 22, 241, 265, 278.
Draupadi, 74n, 85, 185, 422; *-keśāmbarākarṣaṇa*, 185; *-svayaṁvaram*, 341.
dreams, 445.
dress, 439; -of kings 402.
drinking, 403, 437, 459; -houses 438; -songs 277; -prohibited in camp, 412.
droṇa, 449.
Droṇa, 10, 186, 189, 193, 205f, 208ff, 354, 363.
Dṛṣadvati, 328f.
Dṛṣṭānta, 259, 274, 302.
Druhyu, 331.
Drum, beatings of, 391.
Drupada, 341.
Drutavilambita, 144.
Duḥśalā, 10, 192, 194.
Duḥśāsana, 192f.
Duncan, 261.
Dupārī, 467.
Durgā, 348, 425f.
Durga Prasad, 451.
Durjaya, 133, 197ff.
Dūrvā, 467.
Duryodhana, 6, 12, 16, 20, 85f, 90, 129, 133ff, 184ff, 189, 192ff, 205ff, 212, 354, 363, 383f, 401, 464.
Duryodhana (Kuntibhoja), 376n, 398n, 407, 464.
Dūtaghaṭotkaca, 2f, 5f, 8ff, 14, 17, 22, 33n, 42, 83f, sources 85; 98, table 119; 133, 146, 187, title 192; plot 192-193; deviations 193; type 193-194; sentiments 194; critical remarks 194-195; 196n, 205, 220n, 261, 264, 276, 309n, 383n, 405n, 469n.
Dūtaghaṭotkacāṅka, 134, 194.
dūtasampāta, 14, 373.
Dūtavākya, 2f, 5, 7, 9, 13ff, 22, 42f, 51, sources 84-85; 87, 109, 118, table 119; 129, 133, 135ff, 144, title 184; plot 184-185; deviations 185; type 186-187; sentiments 187; critical remarks 187-188; 204, 220n, 227, 293, 301n, 307, 400n ff, 405, 411n, 422, 427n, 452n, 458n, 463, 468n.
Dutt, R. C. 367n f, 384, 434n, 436n f.
Dvāraka, 326.
Dvivedi Abhinandana Grantha, 22n, 46n.
dyeing, 446; dyers' vats 446.
Dynasties of the Kali Age, 306n, 342n.
Early Hindu Civilization, 367n f, 434n, 436n f.
Early History of the Dekkan, 66n.
Early History of India, 62n, 76n, 88n, 100n, 443n.
Eder, 339.
Egypt, 336, 446.
Elephants, 408ff, 412, 414, 426, 441ff; - stables 396; - war ornaments of 410.
Encamping, 412.
Endogamy, 366, 374.
Enemy as guest, 400.
engraver, 446.
ensigns, 409.

Epic India, 318, 384n, 409n, 442n, 458n, 460n.
Erannaboa, 343.
Essai sur Gunâdhya, 264n.
Exogamy, 366, 371, 376.
export, 448.
Fábri, Dr. C. L., 317n.
fabrics, 446n.
Family life, 461-463; -in *Rgveda*, Buddhist and Mauryan Age 461-462; - in Bhâsa 462-463.
Faridpur, 336.
Farokhabad, 341.
Fathgad, 341.
Fausböll, V., 318.
Fergusson, J., 417.
Feronia Elephantum, 466.
Festgabe Garbe, 38n, 108.
Festgabe Jacobi, 44n, 61n, 113n ff.
festive assemblies, 440.
Festivities, Sports and Pastimes, 440-441.
Festschrift Kuhn, 85n, 123n.
Fick, Dr. R., 318f, 357n, 359n, 447, 453n *f*.
fire-ordeal, 217; fire-shrine 268*f*, 422; fire-wood 412.
fish, 437*f*.
Flags or weapons of deities exhibited outside, 419.
Fleet, Dr. J. F. 77n, 320.
flesh-eating, 439; - among Brâhmaṇas 438; - forbidden 437.
flight in war condemned, 400.
Florence Nightingale, 409.
Florists, 389, 423, 448; flowers 446*f*.
flutes, 423.
Food and Dress, 436-439.
footmen 412; footsoldiers 413.
Foreign invaders, 409; -policy 404; - relations 405.
Forestry, 407.
Forms of Greetings in Bhâsa, 463-465.
Fortifications, 388, 391.
Frankfort, Dr. H., 317n.
Funeral pyre, 469, 471.
Funerary customs, 468-470.
furniture, 393, 417, 419.
furs, 446.
Further Excavations at Mohenjo-Dâro, 317*n*.
gacchia, 17, 158.
gadâ, 414n, 415.
Gadamukteśvara, 346.
gaḍua, 127, 158.
Gaertnera Racemosa, 467.
Gajasâhvaya, 346.
Gambling, 403, 456; - forbidden in camps 457 ; - in *Rgveda*, Indus people, epics and *Arthaśâstra* 456-457; - in Bhâsa 458.
Gaming house, 232, 239, 390, 457; gaming hall 458; gaming table 393.
Gaṇâdhipa, 429.
Gaṇapati, 428*f*.
Ganapati Sastri, See Sastri, T. Ganapati.
Gandari, 331.
Gandhamâdana, 347.
Gândhâra, 323, 326, 330-331, 332, 339, 447.
Gândhâri, 86, 192, 194, 197, 199.
Gandharva, 236, 240, 367, 369, 371ff, 375-376, 472.
Gandharvadeśa, 331.
Gandharvas, 179, 217, 219, 369.
Gaṇeśa, 429n; Gaṇeśa worship 429.
Gaṅgâ (Ganges) 192, 323, 328, 337, 341ff, 345*f*, 348, 425, 443.
Gangetic Valley, 442.
Gaṇikâ, 151.
ganhadi (*o ti*) 127.
Ganjam, 347.
Garbe, Dr. R., 61n.
garbha, 186.
garden, 419.
Garhwal, 325, 347*f*.
garland makers, 389, 423, 448.
Garuḍa, 185, 222, 225.
Gâtrasevaka, 438, 463n.
Gaûḍavaha, 42.
Gautama, 63, 65, 101, 367; *Gautama*, 405n; -Buddha, 342.
Gâutamadharmasûtra, 362.
Gayâ, 333, 344.
Gazipur, 348.
geha, 158.
Geldner, Dr. K., 351.
gems, 446.
genhadi, 127.
Gentleman of the town, 393-394.

Gertrude, 262.
Getty, Alice, 429n.
ghala, 158.
ghana, 423.
Gharial, 437.
Ghaṭa Jātaka, 428n.
Ghatak, Prof. J. C., 1, 41n *f*, 111n *f*, 217, 427n.
Ghaṭakarpara, 106*f*; *Ghaṭakarpara-kāvya*, 3, 106-107.
Ghaṭotkaca, 7, 10, 18, 43, 136, 192*ff*, 201*ff*, 405n.
ghee, 436, 438*f*.
Ghettos, 391.
ghidam, 438.
ghoṣa, 223, 394.
Ghosal, Dr. U. N., 69n, 80n.
Ghoṣavatī, 266, 268, 284, 410.
Ghose, M., 131n.
Ghosh, Dr. B. K., 175n, 179n.
Ghosh, N. N., 62n.
Ghoṣita-Ārāma, 342.
Girivraja, 333, 345.
Gladiator, 441.
goat, 438.
Godāvarī 331*f*.
Gokula, 73, 222*f*, 427.
Gold, 446*f*, 450*f*.
golden deer, 251, 255.
goldsmiths, 393, 423, 446, 448.
goliṅga, 443.
Gomti, 328, 345.
Goṇḍa, 330; Goṇḍavana, 347.
Gopāla, 164, 305*f*.
Gopālaka, 306, 325, 337*f*.
Gopatha Brāhmaṇa, 334n.
Gopa youths and maidens, 224; Gopīs 75, 225.
goruta, 450.
gosthī, 303, 383n, 441; *gosthījanas* 383, 441.
gotra, 366, 368.
Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, 2, 24, 33n, 49, 83, 97, 110*f*, 167.
grains, 437.
Grammatical solecisms, 104.
granthikas, 175*f*, 178.
Greek Influence, 80, 137, 139; Greek Origin 177, 180; Greek Women 401; Greeks 383*f*, 388, 409, 446, 460.
Greengroceries, 447.
gṛhaja, 453.
Gṛhasthāśrama, 360.
Gṛhya Sūtras, 428, 469.
Guest houses, 396.
Guhaka Niṣāda, 345.
Guilds of tradesmen, 447*f*.
Gujrat, 311, 338*f*.
gulam, 438.
Guleri, C., 1, 107.
Guṇāḍhya, 87, 264.
Gundappa, Mr. L., 88.
Gune, Dr. P. D., 264n.
guñja, 449.
gunpowder, 409.
Gupta inscriptions, 405; Guptas 352.
Gwalior, 328, 338.
Haetera, 177.
hage, 158; *hagge*, 158.
Haihayas, 327.
Hair, parting of, 383.
Hallīsaka, 224, 395, 441.
Hamlet, 262; *Hamlet*, 239, 276.
Hamsa, 432.
Haṁsaka, 72, 266.
Hanuman, 46*f*, 96, 212*ff*, 217, 254*f*, 405, 434.
Hanuman Nāṭaka, 57.
harakiri, 471.
Harappa, 469.
Haraprasada Sastri, MM., See Sastri Haraprasada.
Harihar Sastri, G. See Sastri, G. Harihar.
Hariṇī, 144, 146.
Haripad, 2.
Harivaṁśa, 54, 86*f*, 226, 259.
Harivarṣa, 326.
Hariyappa, Prof. H. L., 44n, 88n, 276n.
Harṣa, 35n *f*, 38, 43, 123, 145, 288, 292, 341.
Harṣacarita, 37, 345.
hasta, 449.
Hastināpura, 199, 323, 329, 335, 342, 346.
Hastiśikṣā, 65, 433; *Hastiśikṣā* 410, 422, 433.
hastivāraka, 415.
Hastyadhyakṣa, 410.
Hāsya, 93, 181, 190, 204, 238, 273.

hāṭaka, 414n, 415.
Hathi Bada, 101n.
hatthavattaka, 442.
Haug, M., 316n, 351.
Hegel, 132.
Hellenic indebtedness, 420.
Hemacandra, 106.
Herdsmen, 12f, 16, 44, 395.
Hermione, 291.
Hertel, Dr. J., 125, 176.
Hiḍimbā, 84, 201ff.
High regard for Brahmaṇas, 228.
Hillebrandt, A., 40, 177, 180n.
Himālaya, 98, 251, 323, 325, 346ff, 369, 446.
Himavat, 69.
Hīnayāna, 431.
Hindu Administrative Institutions, 77n, 360n, 405n.
Hindu Civilization, 447n.
Hindu Exogamy, 68n, 376n.
Hindu Law, 377n.
Hindu Polity, 77n, 320n.
Hindu Theatre, 305n.
Hirananda Sastri, See Sastri, Hirananda.
Hiraṇvatī, 328.
History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, 3n.
History of Dharmaśāstra, 67n.
History of Indian Literature, (Winternitz) 85n, 175n, 318n, 360n, 458n, 468n.
History of Indian Logic, 65n.
History of Sanskrit Literature (Keith), 4n, 51n, 83n, 117n, 128n, 168n, 273n, 286n, 319n.
History of Sanskrit Literature, (Macdonell), 6n, 62n, 101n, 426n.
Hivargaonkar, B. R., 3n, 41n, 118n.
Hoernle, A., 338.
honey, 437.
Honour to elders, 468.
Horoscope, 375, 434.
horses, 411f, 441ff; horse sacrifice 436; horse stables, 391.
Horticulture, 446.
Humpi, 341.
Hūṇadeśa 325.
hunting, 440.
Hypergamy, 376.
Ibsen, 276.
Idol Worship in Vedic, Buddhist and Mauryan periods 428-429; - in Bhāsa 429-430.
Ihāmṛga, 182, 184, def. 203; def. 272 ; 273.
Ikṣvāku, 19, 210, 217, 245f, 253, 329, 332, 357.
Ilankovadigal, 73.
Imperial History of India, 271n.
import, 448.
Indian Culture through Ages, 363n, 382n f, 398n, 402n f, 405n, 410n.
India's Past, 23n, 152n.
Indika, 101, 319, 460n.
Indological Pragnesia, 55.
Indra, 85, 126, 189f, 251, 268, 424ff, 428, 440f, 467.
Indrajit, 101, 214, 216.
Indramaha, 227, 440.
Indrayajña, 222, 227, 394.
Indurāja, 112.
Indus Culture, 317, 331, 338, 387, 417f, 421, 424, 428, 439, 446, 456.
Indus people, dress of, 439.
infantry, 408, 410, 413, 414.
Ingli, 466.
intercalary month, 434.
interest, 448.
interior decorations, 417.
intermarriages, 351.
Introduction to Prakrit, 126n.
Iron, 446, 449, 451; ironsmith 446, 448.
Irony, comic 10 ; - tragic 10 ; - of situation 260.
Isaacs, M., 465n.
ivory workers, 446.
Iyengar, Dr. S. Krishnaswami, 147.
Iyer, Sir C. P. Ramaswami, 132n.
Iyer, Prof. K. A. Subramania, 70n, 127.
Iyer, K. G. Sesha, 1, 35.
Jacobi, Dr. Hermann, 1, 61n, 77, 83, 316, 320.
jāgarikā, 431.
Jahagirdar (Jagirdar), Prof. R. V., 3n, 4, 12, 17, 19n, 20f, 61n, 155.
Jahrawar, 339.

Jainas, 68, 80, 264, 270, 307, 309, 352, 431.
Jaipur, 334f.
Jalhana, 36, 112, 114.
Jambīra, 466.
Janaka, 335.
Janakapura, 336.
Janamejaya, 342, 346.
Janapada, 388.
Janārdana, 195.
Janasthāna, 249, 252f, 323, 331-332.
Janavarmā, 112.
Janmabhūmi, 344.
Janvier, E. P., 177n.
Japāpuṣpa, 467.
Jarāsandha, 205, 333.
Jasmine, 467.
Jātakas, 62, 68, 87, 89, 176, 318f, 327, 331, 341, 355ff, 359, 371, 380ff, 393, 398, 420, 434f, 437f, 440n, 446f, 451, 453, 457, 459, 469.
Jaṭāyu, 251.
Jāti, 350, 359.
Java, 443, 446.
javelins, 414.
Jayadeva, 43f, 47.
Jayadratha, 10, 192f.
Jayamaṅgala, 89.
Jayānaka, 107.
Jayaswal, Dharmashila, 204n.
Jayaswal, Dr. K. P., 1, 4n, 19n, 61n f, 66n, 69, 77, 99, 100n, 271n, 306n, 320, 421, 427n, 453n.
Jayavardhana, 112.
Jayavarman, 236, 239, 373f, 376n.
Jessore, 336.
Jewellers, 423, 448.
Jha, MM. Dr. Ganganath, 354n.
Jha, V., 131n.
Jhelum, 335.
jīva, 432.
Jñānakośa (Marathi) 426n, 431n.
Jog-ghat, 344.
John Galsworthy, 276.
Johnston, Dr. E. H., 5, 19n, 21, 59, 92n, 257n, 275, 289f, 303, 430f.
Joint family, 461f.
Jolly, Dr. J., 1, 38, 61n, 63n, 67n, 108f, 155, 319.
Jonarāja, 107.
Jonesia Asoka Roxb, 466.
Joshi, Prof. C. V., 385, 388n, 393n, 426n, 428n, 442n.
Julius Cæsar, 57.
Jumna, 322, 324.
Junnar, 346.
Kadali, 467.
Kadam, 466.
Kadamba, 435, 465f.
Kādambari, 173.
kadua, 127, 158.
Kahāpana, 453.
Kaikeyī, 87, 242ff, 247f, 252ff, 260, 262f, 354, 373, 376, 444n.
Kailāṣa Parvata, 346; Kailāsa Puram, 2.
Kaiśikī, 272.
kākalī, 168.
kākaṇi 452.
kākiṇi, 451f.
Kakṣyā, 138f, 140f.
Kalā, 450.
Kalam, 466.
Kalaśaka, 112, 115.
Kālāṣṭami, 355, 427.
Kalāya, 250.
Kale, M. R., 1.
Kālidāsa, 61, 69f, 75, date 75n; 76, 80f, 91, 93, 96, 112, 116, 122ff, 128, 130, 135, 145, 147, 165, 169, 259, 275, 309f, 401, 464.
Kaliṅga, 332, 337.
Kāliya, 224f, 227.
Kalyāṇasaugandhika, 3, 24, 149.
Kāmadevānuyāna, 441; Kāmadevamahotsava 441.
Kamala, 465.
Kamalākarabhaṭṭa, 74n.
Kāmaśṛṅgāra, 29f.
Kāmasūtra, 89, 241, 264n, 441.
Kāmboja, 323, 326-27, 411.
Kampil, 341.
Kāmpilya, 109, 323, 341.
Kaṁsa, 6, 12, 130, 143, 221ff, 225ff, 305, 344, 348, 354, 389, 426f, 470.
Kaṁsa-ka-tila, 344.
Kaṁsavadha, 178.
Kanakacampaka, 467.
Kanakaśakti, 169, 460.
Kaṇaya, 414n, 415.

Kāñcuktya, 7, 11f, 397, 416.
Kane, Prof. P. V., 2, 5, 21n, 26n, 40f, 61n, 65n, 67n, 69n, 71ff, 75ff, 98n, 100n, 102, 130n, 155, 259, 320.
Kaniṣka, 79.
Kanoj, 341.
Kaṇṭhatrāṇa, 416.
Kāuti, 92n.
Kāṇva Nārāyaṇa, 69.
Kanyāntaḥpura, 103, 135.
Kanyāpura, 231ff, 237ff; -prāsāda 141, 397.
Kapiśīrṣakas, 396.
Kapittha, 466.
Kārāgāra, 344.
Kārakadīpaka, 301.
Karāla Janaka, 335.
Karambha, 436.
Karaṇḍu, 332.
Karandikar, J. S., 118.
karaṭṭa, 158.
Karavāla, 414n, 416.
karia, 17, 158.
Karṇa, 20, 85, 90, 109, 188ff, 199, 205, 208, 323, 464, 468.
Karṇabhāra, 2f, 5f, 8f, 17f, 20, 22, 83f, sources 85; 90, 109, table 119; 120, 126, 133n, 143f, 146, title 188; plot 189; deviations 189-190; type 190; sentiments 190; critical remarks 190-192; not a tragedy; new interpretation of title; 194n, 200, 204, 353f, 357n, 362n, 411n, 415n, 426n, 433, 464n, 468n.
Karnal, 329.
Karṇapūraka, 296, 302.
Karpaṇa, 414n, 415.
Karṣa, 449, 451; Kārṣāpaṇa, 451.
Kārtika festival, 440.
Kārtikeya, 169, 425f, 460.
Kārtyāyani, 223, 426f, 429, 434, 445.
Karuṇa, 90, 194, 200, 203, 218, 226, 238, 257, 287.
Kāśa, 282, 467.
Kashmir, 311, 326, 335, 346, 447.
Kāśī, 323, 327-328.
Kāśīrāja, 230ff, 235f, 373, 376n, 445.
kāṣṭhā, 450.
Kāśyapa, 250.
Kathakas, 178,181.
Kathāsaritsāgara, 87ff, 237, 264n, 286, 288, 290n, 306, 331, 405.
Kathians, 383.
Kathiawar, 311, 338f,
Kaṭhopaniṣad, 425.
Katre, Dr. S. M., 128n.
kattabbaka, 431n.
kattavvakaratthi, 430, 431n; *kattavvakarittī*, 430, 431n.
Kātyāyana, 66, 342.
Kaumodaki, 185.
Kaumudīmahotsava, 75n.
Kauñjāyana, 230f, 239.
Kauravas, 10, 85, 184, 186, 188f, 192, 195, 206f, 209.
Kausalyā, 243, 246f, 252, 256.
Kauśāmbī, 79, 265, 269f, 286, 323ff, 337f, 341-342; 346, 410.
Kauśiki, 328.
Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, 331n, 334.
Kauṭilya, 64, 68, 72, 77f, 80f, 100, 140, 169, 239, 264, 275, 308, 319f, 334, 351, 356, 359, 370n, 371, 392, 396f, 403ff, 412ff, 429, 431, 435, 444, 452, 454f, 457, 461f, 471.
Kautukamālā, 375; Kautukamaṅgala 280, 374.
Kavaca, 414n, 416.
Kavacāṅka nāṭaka, 192, 194.
Kavaṭh, 466.
Kāveri, 347.
Kavi, Prof. M. Ramakrishna, 2f, 51n, 52, 56n, 69n, 76n f, 98n, 108ff, 166n.
Kavīndravacanasamuccaya, 114.
Kavivimarśa, 34ff.
Kāvyādarśa, 33.
kāvyaguṇas of Bhāsa, 92n.
Kāvyālaṃkāra, 72; *-sūtravṛtti*, 71.
Kāvyalinga, 273f, 287, 301f.
Kāvyānuśāsana, 106f, 181, 194n, 200, 273.
Kāvyaprakāśa, 74n.
Kedāranātha, 348.
Keith, Dr. A. Berriedale, 1, 4, 21, 23n, 34n, 35, 40n, 44, 47, 51, 61n, 64, 65n, 67n, 77n, 83ff, 87, 89, 92n f, 97n, 105n f, 110, 117n, 123f, 126n ff, 130n ff,

134, 137ff, 143n, 145n, 155, 168, 175n ff, 194, 209, 219, 263, 271, 273n, 275, 286, 290n, 304f, 308, 316n f, 319.
Kekayas, 369, 421, 439.
Kelkar, K. N. and Khare, B., 377n
Kerala: actors 58f; -influence 47, 52-56; -kings 309, 422; -nāṭakacakra 58f; -reform 57; -school 5n; -theatre 130, 170, 277.
Kern, Dr. H., 351.
Kesari (Poona), 118.
Keśava, 405; -dāsa 84; -deva 344.
Keśī, 224.
Ketkar, Miss G., 130n, 137n, 139f.
Ketkar, Dr. S. V., 62n, 264n, 271, 289n.
Ketumālā, 348.
Keyūras, 384.
Khaḍga, 414n, 416.
Khadira, 415.
Khāṇḍava, 328.
Khanitra, 416.
Khara, 250.
Kharapaṭa, 100f, 169f, 461; Kharapaṭṭa 461n.
Khāravela, 99.
Khasi, 336.
Khiraoli, 338.
khu, 17.
Khuperkar, B. M., 24n, 61n, 74n, 97n, 111n f, 155.
Kicakas, 206, 208.
King: at battle 413; -coronation of 402; -disappearance of 403; -dress of 402; heavy responsibilities 399-400; timetable 398-399; kingship 397-398, 403.
King Lear, 261.
Kiraṇāvalī, 3, 35, 106.
Kirāta (=Soman, Mr. K. L.), 20, 61n, 88n, 106, 118, 155, 304n, 309n.
Kish, 446.
Kiṣkindhā, 9, 212, 323, 341, 349.
Kitchen, 412, 418.
Koccham, 419.
Kohala, 130n.
Kokanada, 282, 465.
Konow, Dr. Sten, 1, 4, 5n, 40n, 61n, 69, 75, 76n, 86n, 97n, 99, 123, 126n, 155, 176n f, 180, 226n, 305, 317n.
Kosala, 292, 323, 327, 329-330, 339f, 401.
Kosama, 341.
krama, 11.
Kramrisch, Dr. Stella, 108n.
Krauñca, 426f; Krauñcadāraṇa 425; Krauñcaparvata, 323, 346.
kriḍā, 25.
Krishnamacharya, Dr. M., 3n, 35n, 106f.
Krishna Sastri, A. R., See Sastri, A. R. Krishna.
Krishnaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume, 320n.
Kṛita, 453.
krośa, 450.
Kṛpa, 206.
Kṛśāśva, 178.
Kṛṣṇa, 6, 20, 73, 75, 84ff, deification 100-101; 102, 113, 132ff, 137, 184ff, 188, 192ff, 199, 221, 223f, 226f, 305, 339, 426ff, 432, 437, 445, 467.
Kṛṣṇā, 331, 343f.
Kṛttikā (-s) 245, 425, 434.
Kṣātra, 367, 369, 373.
Kṣatrapa, 69, 99, 102.
Kṣatriyas, 318, 350ff, 356-357, 360, 366, 369, 373, 375, 377, 385, 398, 421, 437, 439, 456.
Kṣetraja, 370.
Kubera, 251, 426.
Kubjā, 344.
Kulajā, 299f.
Kulaśekharavarman, 149.
Kuliśa, 414n.
Kulkarni, Prof. K. P., 61n, 79n, 175n, 180n.
Kulkarni, Prof. P. V., 156n.
Kumārasambhava, 116.
Kumārila, 68, 77, 471.
Kumbha, 449.
Kumbhadatta, 16.
Kumbhakarṇa, 216.
Kumuda, 465; Kumudaka, 216.
Kuṇāla Jātaka, 381.
kuṇḍalas, 188, 384.
Kundamālā, 70-71.
Kuṇḍina, 333.

Kundodara, 427.
Kunhan Raja, Dr. C., See Raja, Dr. C. Kunhan.
Kunta, 414n. 415.
Kunte, M. M., 322n, 428.
Kunti, 328, 338.
Kuntibhoja (King) 67, 229, 235ff, 345, 373, 376n, 390, 398n, 403, 407.
Kuntibhoja, 323, 328.
Kuppuswami Sastri Commemoration Volume, 48n.
Kuppuswami Sastri, Prof. S., See Sastri, Prof. S., Kuppuswami.
Kuraṅgi, 52, 114, 147, 230ff, 240, 373ff, 382n, 472.
Kuravai, 73.
Kūrpāsa, 416.
Kuru, 323, 328-329, 346.
Kuru army, 395n; -war 195.
Kurujāṅgala, 323, 329, 348.
Kurukṣetra, 329.
Kurupañcālas, 329.
Kuśa, 330, 333, 341.
Kuśa grass, 250, 467.
Kuśāmba, 341.
Kuśavatī, 330.
Kushan, 152n.
Kusumadhvaja, 342.
Kusumapura, 342.
Kusumopulo, 343.
Kuṭhāra, 416.
Kuṭiyāttam, 55.
Kuṭṭiṇī, 238; *Kuṭṭiṇīmata*, 74n.
Kuvalaya, 465.
Lacôte, Dr. F., 1, 264n, 286.
Laghuyāna, 443.
Lājā, 368.
Lakṣaṇādhyakṣa, 452.
Lakṣmaṇa, 10, 87, 89, 143, 212f, 215ff, 220, 241n, 243ff, 251f, 254ff, 260.
Lakṣmī, 217, 426.
Lakṣmīdhara, 114.
Lakuliśa, 63.
Lalita, 183.
Lalitavistara, 342.
lamp-posts, 392.
lances, 414.
Land revenue, 407.
Langdon, Dr. S., 317n.
Languages and Literature, 433-434.
Laṅkā, 96, 213ff, 227, 323, 336, 345, 349, 389f.
Lapidary, 420, 446.
Lassen, Dr., 326.
lava, 450.
Lāvāṇaka, 278f, 287, 323, 348-349, 404.
Law, Dr. B. C., 322, 323n f, 326n ff, 330n, 333n ff, 337n ff, 344n, 371n, 382n.
Law, Dr. N. N., 77, 317n, 320, 443n.
lead, 446.
leather-guards, 414.
Legacy of India, 359n.
Leontes, 291.
Lesny, Dr. V., 1, 61n, 122.
Lévy, Dr. Sylvain, 2, 30ff, 43, 57, 102n, 129n, 153f, 178n, 305n.
Licchavis, 442.
likṣā, 449.
Lime, 466.
Lindenau, Dr. Max, 1, 3f, 33n, 40, 61n, 97n, 129, 132n.
Liṅga worship, 424.
liquor, 439.
Little Clay Cart, 300n, 304n.
Loans, 445, 448.
Lodhara, 466.
London, 340.
long journeys, 448.
Love, 300.
Lüders, Dr. H., 132n, 178, 179n.
Ludwig, Dr. A., 351.
lunar month, 434.
lute, 423.
mā, 127.
Macbeth, 27, 57, 227, 261.
Maccheri, 334.
Macchiavillian, 407.
MacCrindle, 350n, 469n.
Macdonell, Dr. A. A., 6n, 23n, 62n, 101n, 152, 316n, 426n.
Macduff, 261.
Mackay, Dr. Ernest, 317.
Madanikā, 160, 196ff, 304, 373, 455n, 459n; Madanikā (hunch-backed) 225; Madanikā-Sajjalaka, 303.
Madayantikā, 323, 348.
Mādhavapura, 339.

Mādhavī, 467; Mādhavīlatāmaṇḍapa, 142.
Madhu, 223, 466.
Madhukaiṭabha, 347.
Madhurā, 343.
Mādhurya, 91, 239.
Madhusūdana, 347.
Madhyama Vyāyoga, 2f, 7f, 10, 13n, 14, 17f, 22, 41, 43, 83, sources 84; 100, table 119; 121, 136, 144, 154, title 201; plot 201-202; deviations, type 203; sentiments 203-204; critical remarks 204-205; 307, 348n, 354n f, 357n, 379n, 382n, 426n, 464.
Madhyama, (Dhruva), 41n, 44n, 84n, 86n, 89n, 273n.
Madhyama, (Janvier), 177n.
Madirā, 426.
Madman's apparel 266, 271; madmen, 406.
Madra, 323, 335, 339, 369, 384.
Madras, 333.
Mādrī, 383.
Madurā, 332, 344, 347.
Maga, 333.
Magadha, 67, 88, 271, 278, 283, 286, 323f, 327, 330f, 333-334, 337, 339, 342, 344f, 364, 402, 404, 407n, 449.
Magadhapura, 344.
Magadhī, 126f.
Magadhikā, 147, 332.
Magic, 135ff, 444; magic ring 234f, 237f.
Magnifera Indica, 466.
Mahābhārata, 62n, 64f, 68, 84ff, 90, 108, 113, 118, 120, 122, 133, 135, 187, 191, 194, 199n, 208, 226, 310, 318, 323f, 326ff, 331, 333, 335ff, 344, 347, 352n, 355, 360f, 368ff, 383ff, 398, 405, 411, 413, 416n, 418, 425f, 428, 431ff, 453, 457, 469.
Mahābhāṣya, 178, 264, 425n.
Mahābrāhmaṇa, 66.
Mahādeva, 347.
Mahājanapadas, 323, 326, 328ff, 333ff, 337ff, 341, 343.
Mahākāleśvara, 340.
Mahānadī, 347.
Mahāpadmananda, 62, 80, 100, 398.
Mahārāṣṭra, 311; Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit 158.
Mahāsamayasutta, 428.
Mahāsena, 7, 9, 11f, 16, 50, 52, 88, 114, 373, 406, 410, 433, 468.
Mahāvagga, 327.
Mahāvaṁsa, 336.
Mahāvīracarita, 145, 148.
Mahāvrata, 177, 179.
Mahendra, 78, 217, 323, 340.
Mahendra (Mt), 347, 349.
Mahendrāditya, 75n.
Mahendramalai, 347.
Mahendravikrama, 112, 116; -varman 39, 149.
Maheśvara, 250.
Maheth, 330.
Māhiṣmatī, 324f.
Māhissatī, 324.
Maholī, 343.
Mohamedan onslaught, 308; Mohamedans, 385f.
Mailed warriors, 414.
Maireya, 439.
Maithilī, 45f.
Maitreya, 43, 294ff, 303f, 472.
Majumdar, Dr. R. C., 351n, 380n, 398n, 436n.
Majumdar-Sastri, Dr. S. N., 328, 336f.
Mākanda, 35n.
Malabar, 377, 422; -influence 157, 173.
Mālāparamparita, 258.
Malatī, 303.
Mālatīmādhava, 49, 74n, 110, 145, 147f, 240f, 304.
Mālava, 328.
Mālavikāgnimitra, 74n, 76, 96, 145, 165.
Malaya, 234, 441; -giri 323, 347, 349; -koṭi 347.
Malayalam, 2; -influence 52; -pandits 56.
Mālinī, 145.
Mallāṅka, 58.
Mallapura, 348.
Mallikā, 467.
Malwa, 348.

Mamulnar, 78.
māna, 198-199.
Manalikkara Matham, 2, 82.
Mānasāra, 417.
Mānasa Sarovara, 234, 346.
Mānavas, 250, 404.
Mānaviya Dharmaśāstra, 356n.
Mandākini, 233.
Maṇḍalāgra, 416.
Mandara, 323, 346-347, 427 ; -giri 346.
Māndhātṛ, 210, 324.
Maṇḍodari, 390.
Maṅgalaśloka, 5, 109, 115, 157.
Manganam, 2
Mankad, Prof. D. R., 71, 75n, 131n, 175n, 182, 187n, 194n, 200n, 203, 209, 272n, 300n.
Manojava, 427.
Manthara 242.
Mantotte, 345.
Mantrāṅka, 58, 277.
Mantraśālā, 397, 401.
Manu, 63, 68, 78, 457.
Manubhāṣya, 21, 64f, 101.
Manumission, 455.
Mānuṣa, 367.
Manuscripts, 47ff, 73, 82f, 122ff, 128, 131, 151, 171, 192n, 203, 216f, 310f.
Manusmṛti, 63f, 68, 77, 101, 203, 259, 310n, 352n, 370n, 372n, 381, 405n, 453.
March of army, 412.
Maritime trade, 445.
Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, 339.
Market place, 232, 390.
Marriages, Anuloma, 358, 366 ; in Vedic, Epic, Buddhist and Mauryan times 366-372 ; in *Dharmaśāstras* and *Smṛtis*, 372-373 ; - in Bhāsa 373-379 ; *Sambandha* marriages 377-378 ; - laws 317 ; political marriages 401-402 ; pratiloma marriages 358, 366.
Mars, 425.
Marshall, Sir John., 317, 388n, 428n, 437n.
māṣa, 450.
māṣa, 449 f ; *suvarṇa māṣa*, 449. 452.
Mason, 446.
Mathurā, 20, 102, 178, 222, 225, 323, 338, 341, 343-344, 387, 389.
Mati, 45.
Mātṛbhakti, 204.
Mātṛkas, 363, 430.
Matsya, 323, 334-335, 345.
Mātsyanyāya, 348.
Matsya Purāṇa, 348.
Mattayāraṇi, 136.
Mattavilāsa, 3, 38f, 44, 58, 101, 109, 112, 115f, 128, 149, 169, 176n.
Maula, 408.
Maurah, 466.
Mauryan Polity, 80n, 320n.
Maurya Period, 349, 411.
Mawana Tahsil, 346.
Max Müller, Dr. F., 63, 175, 316, 351.
māyā, 136, 236.
Mayūra, 36, 43.
Māyūrāja, 35n, 288.
Meat, 437ff.
Medhātithi, 21, 64f, 100f, 250, 259.
Medicines, 435 ; Medical Assistants 409.
Meerwarth, A. M., 1, 65f, 87n, 89n, 92n, 132n, 133f, 187, 275n, 292.
Megasthenes, 101, 319, 338, 343, 350, 413n, 426, 438, 454f, 460.
Megasthenes und Kauṭilya, 319n.
Meghadūta, 29, 75n.
Meghanāda, 234, 347.
Meghna, 336.
Mehendale, K. C., 151.
Mekala, 449.
Memoirs of the Archæological Survey of India, No. 28 : *Bhāsa and the Authorship of the Thirteen Trivandrum Plays* 152n, 155n, 164n, 468n f.
Menander, 99.
Mendicants, 406.
Menon, T. K. K., 48.
Menṭha, 112.
Mercury, 392.
Meru, 323, 347-348.
Metallurgy, 448.
Methora, 338.

Metrics, 66, 143-146.
Michelia Champaka, 467.
Middle Ages, 391.
Military Operations, 399 ; -Organization 408-416.
Milk, 436, 439.
Mimusops Elengi, 465.
Mines, 407 ; Mining 448.
Ministers, 403-405.
Mirat (Meerut), 346.
Mithi, 335.
Mithilā, 323f, 335-336.
Mithyājīva, 435.
Mitra, Dr. Rajendralal, 417.
Mitrabala, 408.
Mixed Castes, 351.
Modakamallaka, 438.
Mohā, 466.
Mohenjo-Dāro, 259, 387, 417f, 424, 428, 436, 444, 446, 451, 469.
Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization, 79n, 260n, 388n, 428n, 437n, 469n.
Molini, 328.
Money lending, 448.
Mongbyr, 323, 333.
Monogamy, 378.
Month intercalary, 434 ; -lunar 434.
Moon, 426.
Mookerji, Dr. Radhakumud, 77n, 320n, 331n, 361n, 382n, 385, 447n.
Morgenstierne, Dr. G., 1, 155f.
Moriṅgā, 467.
Mortgage, 448.
Mṛcchakaṭika, 20, 24, 30, 51, 54, 58, 62, 70f, 76, 89, 100n, 103, 110, 140, 147f, 150, 152f, Acts V-X 154-155 ; Relationship 155ff; vocabulary 157 ; technique and Prakrit 158-159 ; dramatic incident 159-160 ; examination 160-163 ; additions 163-164 ; political byeplot 164-165 ; authorship 165, different recensions (?) 166-167 ; differences 167-170 ; 171, contrary views 172-174 ; 180, 241, 298f, 302, 304ff, 325, 393, 458, 460.
Mudgara, 414n, 415.
Mudrālaṁkāra, 5.
Mudrārākṣasa, 40, 148.
Mugdha-śṛṅgāra, 203.
Muhūrta, 450.
Muir, J., 351.
Mukha, 43, 182.
Mukhopadhyaya, 124n.
Mukteśvara Mahādeva, 346.
Mukuṭatāḍitaka, 106.
Mūladeva, 169f.
Mūlaka, 332.
Mūlaviddhi, 448n.
Mules, 442.
Multan, 339.
Muṇḍakopaniṣad, 125.
Mūrchanā, 168.
Murshidabad, 323, 336.
musala, 414n, 415.
Music, 18, 423, 440, 459 ; music hall 397 ; musicians 393.
Muslin, 439.
Muṣṭika, 6, 143, 225, 344, 470.
Mūtibas, 332.
Mutton, 437f.
Muzaffarpur, 336.
Mysore, 78, 348.
Mysore Archæological Report for 1909-10, 3n.
Mystery, 176.
Nadia, 336.
Nāgānanda, 3, 35f, 58, 148.
Nagara, 388 ; - catvara 390.
Nāgarika, 394.
Nāgas, 438.
Nāgavana, 63, 73, 265, 323, 348.
Nagnajit, 332.
Nagnā Śramaṇikā, 63.
nagnikā rule, 372.
Nāgodārika, 416.
nahānamālam, 371.
Nairs, 422.
Nakṣatras, 79, 168, 434.
Nala, 456.
Nalagiri, 275.
Nālandā, 311.
Nālikā, 10, 147, 231ff, 235, 240.
Nalodaya, 55.
Names inscribed on arrows, 414.
Nāṇaka, 79, 167, 452.
Nanda, 100, 342 ; Nandagopa 102, 122, 226.
Nandaka, 185.
Nandayantī, 29.

Nāndī, 96-98, 157, 160.
Nandigrāma, 340.
Nandilaka, 253.
Nāndyante etc, 3, 5, 37ff.
Nara, 347.
Nārāca, 414n, 415.
Nārada, 8, 67, 143, 221, 226, 236f, 240, 286, 457, 468.
Nārada (dramatist), 130n.
Narasimhachar, R., 2.
Naravāhanadatta, 338, 405n.
Nārāyaṇa, 221, 226, 229, 347, 468.
Nārāyaṇa Kāṇva, 99.
Nariman, G. K., 264n.
Narmadā, 79, 323, 332, 344n, 348.
Nasik, 331.
Nāṭaka, 182, def. 217-218; 226, 238, 256, 273, 287.
Naṭakalakṣaṇaratnakośa, 25, 32, 153, 289n.
Naṭasūtra, 67, 130, 178.
nāthe, 157.
Nāṭikā, 182ff, def. 272.
Nature description, 93-96.
Nāṭyadarpaṇa, 25, 30f, 33f, 37f, 47, 166f, 194n, 200n, 203.
Nāṭyaśāstra, 6, 8, 25, 41n, 45, 67, 92, 102, 106, 129-132, 135, 137ff, 179, 300n, 401n, 433.
Nāṭyasūtra, 130.
Nautch girls, 459.
Navigation, 443f.
Nāyaka, 410.
nāyike, 157.
Nepal, 311, 329.
Nepathyabhūmi, 138.
Nerurkar, V. R., 61n, 155.
neubbhāmana, 438.
New Light on the Most Ancient East, 317n.
neyyubbhāmana, 157.
nhāna cuṇṇamūlam, 371.
Nibandhakāras, 381.
nica, 45.
Nicakṣu, 342, 346.
Nicula, 465f.
Nigama, 388.
Night description, 96; night guards 392.
Nīla, 212, 254, 427.
Nīlakaṇṭha, 38, 108f, 164; Nīlakaṇṭha (*Mahābhārata*) 335.
Nīlotpala, 465.
Nimbu, 466.
nimeṣa, 450.
Nimi, 332, 335.
Nipa, 435, 465f.
Nirājanavidhi, 410f.
Nirvahaṇa, 182.
Niṣādas, 366.
niṣka, 450f.
niṣkramya praviśya, 7, 154.
Nistriṃśa, 415.
Niśumbha, 348.
Nītiśāstra, 403.
nityakarmas, 428.
Niv, 466.
niyamas, 382.
Niyoga, 370.
non-combatants, 413.
Nose ring, 384.
Nouveau riche, 45.
Nṛga, 210.
Nṛsiṃha, 426.
Numismatics, 320, 450-452.
Nūpura, 384.
Nurses, 409.
Nyagrodha, 222, 466.
Nyāyaśāstra, 100f, 250, 259, 356; - of Medhātithi 63, 64-65, 356n.
Nyāyavirodha, 72-73.
Nyctanthes Arbor Tristes, 467.
Ocean description, 95.
Oxford History of India, 88n.
Ogden, C. J., 88.
Ojas, 91, 239.
Oldenberg, Dr. H., 176, 333, 337, 351, 468n.
Omens, 444.
Ophir, 339.
Origin of Indian Drama, 175-180.
Orissa, 332, 347.
Ornaments, 439.
Ottorakorra, 325.
Oudh, 339.
Outline of Ancient Indian History and Culture, 380n, 436n.
Pabna, 336.
pada, 449.
pādapūraṇas, 104.
Padhye, K. A., 169, 371n.

Padika, 409.
Padmā (River), 336.
Padmanābhapuram, 2, 82.
Padmaprābhṛtaka, 51, 109f, 169.
Padmapurāṇa, 54, 259.
Padmapurāṇa and Kālidāsa, 54.
Padmāvatī, 25f, 28f, 31f, 90, 142, 278ff, 285ff, 290ff, 307n, 337.
pādya, 18, 226, 468.
Padyacūḍāmaṇi, 75n, 124n.
Painters, 393; Painting 409, 422-423.
Paippalāda, 327.
Paiśāca, 367f, 372.
Paiṭṛka, 453.
Pakkaṇa, 395n.
pakṣa, 450.
pala, 449, 451.
Pāla, 306.
Palace of a king, 396-397; palace theatre 402.
Pālaka, 20, 164, 173, 299, 305f, 337.
Palanquins, 442ff, 458.
Palāśa, 466.
Pali, 158.
Palibothra, 343.
Pallava, 69, 98; Pallava kings 56.
Pallaṅka, 419.
Palmyra tree, 224.
paṇa, 452.
Pāñcajanya, 185.
Pañcāla, 341.
Pañcālika, 415.
Pañcaparvata, 348.
Pañcarātra, 2ff, 14, 16ff, 22, 33n, 42ff, 51, 57, 83, sources 86; 95, 105, 109, 114, table 119; 121, 126, 144, 148, 154f, 201, 204, title 205; plot 205-208; deviations 208-209; type 209-210; sentiments 210; critical remarks 210-212; 227, 276, 293, 309n, 353n ff, 357f, 362n f, 382n, 387, 391n, 394f, 400n, 410n f, 413n f, 432, 433n, 441n, 445n, 463f, 465n, 468n.
Pañcarātra system, 105, 427, 431-432.
Pañcavaṭī, 331.
Pāṇḍavas, 10, 20, 86, 133, 185, 189f, 193, 196, 199, 201, 203, 205ff, 265, 334f, 340, 370, 401.
Pāṇḍu, 370.
Pāṇḍya, 69, 98, 309; - kings 56.
Pangu, Prof. D. S., 260.
Paṇis, 445.
Pāṇini, 66f, 130, 322, 324, 326, 329, 331f, 365, 398, 426, 428, 432, 451.
Panipat, 329.
Pāpahāriṇī, 347.
Paradise, 467.
parākrama, 400.
Parākramaṇi Prasādi, 75n, 120n, 124n, 145n.
paramāṇu, 449.
Paranjape, Prof. S. M., 1, 4, 17n, 26n, 36n, 38n, 40n, 48n, 49, 53, 54n, 56, 65n, 74n ff, 97n, 103n f, 112n, 148, 151, 155f, 159f, 255n, 259n, 263n.
Paranjape, Dr. V. G. and Raddi Sastri, 304n.
Parantapa, 342.
Paraśu, 416.
Paraśurāma, 74, 85, 109, 189, 329.
Pargiter, F. E., 306n, 316n, 331, 335f, 342n, 348.
paribhramaṇa, 138, 141.
paricārikā, 431n.
Pārijātaka, 466f.
Parikara, 273.
parikramaṇa, 143.
pariraya, 449.
pariṣad, 398; *parispanda*, 211.
Parivrājaka, 363f.
Parivrāṭ, 168.
pāriyānika, 443.
Parks, 419, 441; Parks and Gardens 446; Parks, Public, 388f, 391.
Pārvatī, 347.
Pārvatīpariṇaya, 15, 115.
Paryāyokta, 258, 274, 301.
Pastoral Life, 394-395; -in Bhāsa, 394f.
Pastyā, 328.
Patākā, 41, 203, 218, 226, 238, 257, 287; -sthānaka 9f, 41.
Pāṭaliputra, 62f, 295, 306, 323, 333f, 342-343, 344.
Patan, 311.

Patañjali, 104, 130, 178, 264, 425, 428.
pater familias, 462.
Pathak, Dr. K. B., 75n.
pathos, 300.
patita, 324.
pātivratya, 370.
Patna, 333, 343f.
Paṭṭāsa, 416.
Patvardhan, Dr. M. T., 146n.
Pauravī, 383.
Pauṣa, 347.
Pavolini, P., 1, 84.
Pearls, 446.
penance-grove, 247, 251.
Pentapetes Phoenicea, 467.
Perfumers, 389, 423, 447.
Pericles, 458.
Persians, 385.
Peruṅgatai *(Bṛhatkathā)*, 88.
Peshawar, 331.
Peterson, Dr. P., 35n.
Phallic worship, 424.
Philosophy in Bhāsa, 431-432.
Phraseolous radiatus, 449.
picture, 422; picture-board 297; picture on a canvas, 422.
Pillars, etc., 417.
Piṇḍola, 342.
Pinnai, 73.
Pinus Longifolia, 465.
Piśāca, 445.
Pischel, Dr. R., 82, 126, 150, 175.
Pischel, Dr. R. and Geldner, Dr. K., 458.
Pisharoti, Prof. A. Krishna., 2, 5, 19, 23n, 26n, 29n, 35n, 38n, 48, 83n, 97n, 124, 152, 164, 172n, 173.
Pisharoti, Prof. A. Krishna and Prof. K. Rama., 21, 29, 34, 53ff, 58n.
Pisharoti, Prof. K. Rama., 2, 3n, 5, 23n, 24, 29n, 32, 35n f, 38, 52f, 55, 58n, 61n, 66, 82f, 97-98, 100n, 108f, 124f, 130n, 155, 170, 171n f, 216, 220, 421, 439n, 471.
Piṭhikā, 443.
Plaiting, 446 ; plaits 383.
Plants and Flowers, 465-468.
Plays (The Thirteen Bhāsa Plays): Authorship 1-60 ; Characterization 89-91 ; Chronological order 118-122 ; Defects 102-104; Description of Nature 93-96 ; Metrics 143-146 ; Prakrit 122-128; Rasas and Alaṁkāras 92-93; Sources 84-89 ; text material 82-84 ; also the different sections under each play in Chapters VII and VIII.
Plays Ascribed to Bhāsa: Their Authenticity and Merits, 3n f, 8n, 13n, 18n f, 21n, 28n, 32n f, 38n, 40n f, 92n, 97n, 100n f, 115n, 123n f, 127n, 152n, 158n, 164n, 166n, 171n f, 240n.
Plunge bath, 471.
Polar Star, 368.
Political Bye-plot, 164-165, 299.
Political History of Ancient India, 78n, 80n, 88n, 97n, 100n, 319n, 322n ff, 340n f, 344n ff, 356n, 401n.
Political marriages 401-402 ; political organization 317 ; political revolution 304-307.
Polonius, 239, 276.
Polygamy, 370f, 378, 461.
Popular Beliefs and Superstitions 444-445.
Pork, 437.
Position of Maidens 382 ; -married women 382.
Potana, 333.
Potarakuṇḍa, 344.
Potiyam, 347.
potta, 158.
potters, 443.
Potti, S. Narayanan, 35n, 56, 57n.
Poultry, 437f.
Prabhāsapaṭṭana, 339.
Prabodhacandrodaya, 148.
Prācetas, 250.
Prācina Mahārāṣṭra (in Marathi) 62n, 264n, 271n, 289n.
Pradhan, Dr. S. N., 325n, 338n, 364n, 471n.
Pradhānani Pratijñā, 44n, 73n, 110n.
Pradyota (=Mahāsena), 50, 62, 88, 265ff, 273ff, 279f, 284ff, 306, 325, 331, 337f, 340, 373,

406f, 410, 422; also called Caṇḍa Pradyota or Pradyota Mahāsena.
Pradyumna, 432.
Praharṣiṇī, 146.
Prahasana, 56, def. 180; 181.
Prahasta, 216.
Prājāpatya, 367f, 371.
Prakaraṇa, 182ff, 238, 271, 273, 293, def. 299; śuddha 183; saṅkīrṇa 183.
Prakaraṇikā, 184.
Prakhyāta, 218, 226.
Prakrit, 66, 75, 83, 122-128, 156ff, 161f, 167, 179, 187, 190, 294, 300, 433, 464; Prakrit archaisms 16-17; Prakrit verses 143; Prakritisms 150.
Prakṛti, 432.
Pramadavana, 142, 389f.
Prang, 331.
praroçanā, 56.
Prāsa, 414n, 415.
Prasāda, 91, 239.
Prasannarāghava, 43.
Praśānta, 183.
Praśasti, 131.
Prasenajit, 325, 327, 329f, 402.
prāśnikas, 139.
Prastāvanā, 3, 6, 32f, 39, 158.
Pratāparudrīya, 209.
Pratardana, 327.
Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa, 2ff, 14ff, 37, 41, 43ff, 49ff, 57, 62, 65, 67f, 72f, 75, 77, 80, 83f, sources, 87-88; 98, 105, 109, 116, table 119; 120, 122, 126n, 135f, 139, 146, 148ff, 166, 169, 238f, title 264-265; plot 265-270; deviations 270-271; type 271-273; sentiments 273-274; critical remarks 274-277; 278, 292, 303f, 307, 325, 344n, 348n, 355n, 373n ff, 377n f, 382n, 391n, 397n f, 401n f, 404n, 406n f, 410n f, 413n f, 420, 422n, 427n, 429, 430n, 433n, 438n f, 441n, 443n f, 448n, 462n ff.
Pratiloma, 358, 366, 370, 372.
Pratimā, 2f, 5ff, 41, 43, 46, 48, 53f, 56f, 63, 67f, 71, 78, 80n, 83f, sources 87; 90, 92n, 95, 100, 105, 113, 118, table 119, 121f, 135f, staging of IV Act 143, 144, 146f, 154, 191, 220, 240n, title 241; plot 241-254; deviations 254-256; type 256-257; sentiments 257-259; critical remarks 259-264; 276n, 302, 307n, 353n f, 356n, 358, 363, 373, 378, 386n, 391n, 397n, 399n f, 402n, 419ff, 423n, 427n, 429n f, 433n f, 439n, 444n, 462ff.
Pratimā (Devdhar), 255n, 257n.
Pratimā (Dhruva), 5n, 21n, f, 46n f, 50n, 241n, 256n f, 263n.
Pratimā (Paranjape), 4n, 17n, 26n, 38n, 40n, 54n, 56n, 74n, 97n, 112n, 255n, 259n, 263n.
Pratimā (QJMS), 52n.
Pratimāgṛha, 53-54, 239, 259, 419-420; situation 419; special preparation 419-420; *pratimās* 421.
pratimukha, 182.
Pratiṣṭhāna, 328.
Prativastūpamā, 74n.
Pravahaṇas, 443f.
pravara, 368.
Pravarasena, 42.
Praveśaka, 183, 318.
Prayogātiśaya, 40n.
Prekṣāgṛha, 137ff.
Premasāgara, 226.
Prices, fixed 448; not fixed 447.
Prince of Denmark, 276.
Princep, 328.
Printz, Dr. W., 1, 126n.
Private coinage, 451.
Priyadarśikā, 3n, 35f, 104n, 106n, 115f, 148, 288.
Priyaṅgu, 465, 467.
Problems (*Some Problems of Indian Literature*), 4n, 6n, 13n, 16n, 18n ff, 26n, 42n, 76n, 82n, 87n, 97n, 99n f, 132n, 164n, 172n, 176n, 219n, 238n, 263n, 271n, 401n.
prologue, 6.
Propitiatory rites, 403.

Prostitution in *Ṛgveda*, *Jātakas* and *Arthaśāstra*, 458-459 ; - in Bhāsa 459.
Pṛthvī, 144.
Pṛthvirājavijaya, 34, 107.
Psychological aspect of diseases, 435.
Ptolemy, 325, 331, 338.
Public Administration in Ancient India, 352n, 398n, 403n, 413n, 454n, 461n.
Public baths, 389, 391 ; public coinage 451f ; public drinking house 390f ; public vices 456-461.
pucchiants, 157.
Pukkusāti, 331.
Punch-marked coins, 451.
Puṇḍras, 332, 337.
Punjab, 346, 442.
Pupphāvatī, 328.
Pur, 387.
Purāṇas, 57, 88, 108n, 226, 306, 325, 331, 333f, 338, 346, 425f.
Purāṇas (coin) 451.
Purdah system, 385f.
Purification, 470-471.
Pūrṇa, 183.
Pūrṇasarasvatī, 29n.
Pūrṇopamā, 218.
puroḍāśa, 436.
Purohita, 404f.
Pursuit of women, 403.
Pūru, 398.
Purūravas, 328, 341 ; Purūravas hymn, 176.
Puruṣa, 432.
Puruṣapura, 331.
Puruṣasūkta, 351.
Puṣkara, 130n.
Puṣkarāvata, 331.
Puṣpaka, 254f.
Puṣpapura, 342.
Puṣpitāgrā, 144, 146.
Puṣyamitra, 99, 170.
Puṣyaratha, 443f.
Pūtanā, 223.
Puttees, 467.
Puttiyal, 2.
Quiver of arrows, 414.
Racial Synthesis of Indian Culture 317n, 352n, 373n, 384n, 408n, 414n.
Radanikā, 294ff.
Raddi Sastri, Rangacharya See Sastri, R. Raddi.
Rādhā, 75, 226.
Rāghava, 247.
Raghu, 245f, 248, 259, 262f, 420.
Raghuvaṁśa, 54, 147.
Rāhu, 378.
Raibhya, 285.
Raichur, 332.
Raja, Dr. C. Kunhan., 1f, 21, 23n, 25f, 30n ff, 34f, 40f, 43, 49, 52, 56f, 61n, 83, 97n, 124f, 130n, 152, 155ff, 170, 173, 174n, 240f, 277n, 308, 310n, 438.
Rajagir, 344.
Rājagṛha, 62f, 278, 286f, 323f, 330, 333f, 342, 344-345, 364, 374n.
Rājaśekhara, 2, 34ff, 47, 112, 115, 148, 311, 420.
Rajashahi, 336.
Rājasiṁha, 69, 98-100, 270.
Rājaśrī, 223, 227.
Rājasūya, 418.
Rājāvalī, 336.
Rajputana, 339.
Rākṣasa, 193, 214, 216f, 222 ; Rākṣasīs 213, 216, 445.
Rākṣasa marriage, 367, 369, 372f, 375.
Rāma, 10, 19f, 45ff, 53, 65, 74, 87, 89, 135f, 143, 210, 212ff, 242ff, 246ff, 260, 262ff, 340f, 345, 379, 398, 402n, 426ff, 430, 464 ; -deification of, 100-101 ;
Rāma dramas, 48.
Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, 25, 30, 33f, 70, 131, 166, 311.
Ramachaura, 345.
Ramakrishna Kavi, M., See Kavi, M. Ramakrishna.
Rāmarakṣāstotra, 434.
Rāmāyaṇa, 62, 71, 84, 87, 90, 121, 130, 135, 217, 241, 249, 255f, 260, 262f, 310, 318, 323, 326, 330f, 333n, 335ff, 340, 344, 346, 349, 385f, 405n, 418n, 428, 433, 442, 446.
Ramayya, V., 219, 256n, 263n.

Rāmila, 165.
Ramma city, 328.
Raṅgapīṭha, 138f, 141, 228.
Raṅgaśīrṣa, 138, 141, 143, 188, 228.
Rantideva, 345.
Rao, K. Sampathagiri, 106.
Rao, Prof. M. Ramachandra, 132n, 133n, 190, 200.
Rapson, Prof. E. J., 62n, 100n, 339.
Rapti, 330, 335, 340.
rasada, 406.
raśanā, 384.
Rasārṇavasudhākara, 186.
Rasas, 92-93, 182f, 186 ; Rasas and Alaṁkāras 92-93 ; see also under each play in Chapters VII and VIII.
rāśis, 79, 168, 434.
rathacakravipruṭ, 449.
Ratnaṣaṣṭhī, 160, 355.
Ratnāvali, 35f, 74n, 106, 115, 148, 166, 277n, 288.
rātri, 450.
Raudra, 45, 93, 182, 203, 226, 273.
Rāvaṇa, 10f, 21, 45ff, 65, 87, 89, 136, 214ff, 220, 227, 250f, 253ff, 259, 262f, 336, 414.
Rāvī, 335.
Rawalpindi, 331.
Ray, Dr. H. C., 356.
Ray, J. C., 79n.
Ray, K., 75n.
Ray, Prof. S., 1, 41, 75n, 277.
Ray Chaudhury, Dr. H. C., 78n, 80n, 88n, 99, 100n, 319n, 322, 323n f, 325f, 327n ff, 340n f, 344n ff, 355, 401n.
Rebirth theory accepted, 433.
Recht und Sitte, 63n, 67n.
Refectory, 418.
Religion des Veda, 468n.
Religion, Philosophy, Literature and Sciences 424-435.
Remarriage, 371f, 375, 378.
Renaldo, 276.
Residential quarters, 392.
Respect for elders, 106.
Rest-houses, 388f.
Revenue, 399.
Revolution, 299, 304.
Rewah, 337.
Ṛgveda, 175, 179, 316, 325, 328, 330, 332, 334, 336, 338, 351f, 360, 366ff, 383, 387, 398n, 408, 411, 414, 417, 424, no mention of idols 428 ; 434, food 436 ; 445, 450f, 456, 458, 468, 470.
Ṛgvedic Culture, 408n, 414n, 446n, 458n.
rice, 436ff, 446.
Ridgeway, W., 179n.
Rintambur, 345.
Rintipur, 345.
ritta, 431n.
Roads, 442ff.
Robbers, 447f.
Rohasena, 173.
Rohiṇī, 245, 434.
Roman Law, 454.
Romapāda, 323.
Romeo and Juliet, 239.
Roofs, 417.
Roruka, 339.
Roth, Dr. R., 351.
ṛṣṭi, 414n, 416.
Ṛtu, 450.
Ṛtusaṁhāra, 51.
Ṛtviks, 471.
Rudra, 424.
Rudrasiṁha, 69, 99.
Rumaṇvan, 268f.
Rumex Vesicarius, 467.
rūpadarśaka, 452.
Rūpaka, 93, 187, 204, 218, 258f, 274, 300f, 452.
Rūpakaṣaṭkam, 21n.
Ryder, Dr. A. W., 300, 304.
Śābarabhāṣya, 68n.
Śabaras, 332.
Sabhika, 457f.
Sacred thread, 353, 461.
Sacrifice, 7, 95, 355, 357, 400, 430, 438.
Ṣaḍānana, 425.
Ṣaḍānīrā, 329, 335f.
Saduktikarṇāmṛta, 112, 114f.
Sāga, 466.
Sāgaranandin, 25, 29, 32f, 70, 153, 311.
sagotra, 372.
Sahadeva, 205.

Sahasrānīka, 337.
Sāhityadarpaṇa, 24, 42n, 72n ff, 93n, 96n, 102n, 181, 200n, 203, 217, 259, 272, 293, 299.
Sāhityasaṁgraha, (in Marāṭhī) 36n, 103n f, 148n, 151n, 160n, 399n.
Sahni, R. B. Daya Ram, 317n, 341, 345.
Sahokti, 187, 259.
Śaibya seeds, 449.
Śailūṣa, 177.
Sairandhrī, 74n.
Śaiśunāga statues, 54, 88n; Śaiśunāga 334, 421.
Śaivism, 424, 427.
Śaivism, 424, 427.
Sajjalaka, 142, 160, 169, 296ff, 300, 304, 359n, 373, 377, 394n, 444.
Śākala, 335.
Śakāra, 11, 43, 126n, 151ff, 172, 294f, 297f, 300, 302, 304.
Śakaṭa, 223, 442f.
Sāketa, 324, 330, 340.
Śakra, 190.
Śakti, 189, 411, 414n, 415; Śakti (Mother) 424, 426.
Śaktibhadra, 47, Bhāsa vs Śaktibhadra, 48-51; 58, 110, 149.
Śakuni, 184f, 192ff, 205f, 208, 212.
Śākuntala, 3, 27, 29, 58, 67n, 75n, 77n, 110, 140, 147, 258f, 293, 304, 464.
Śakuntalā, 303.
Śākuntalacarcaṇā, 109, 309n; See also *Śākuntalavyākhyā*.
Śākuntalavyākhyā, 24f, 32f, 158n, 167, 309n; See also *Śākuntalacarcaṇā*.
Śākya, 329f, 402; Śākyakula 441; Śakyaśramaṇaka 63, 168.
Śāla, 465.
Śala, 449.
Śalākā, 415.
Śālaka, 265f, 276.
Śālaṅkāyana, 266.
Sale, 445.
salilam salilam, 148.
Śālini, 146.
Salt, 407, 448.
Śalya, 85, 189f, 335.
śama, 449.
Samagra, 183.
Samāja, 441.
Samāsa, 14.
Samatā, 92n.
Samavakāra, 182, 184, def. 209; 210.
Samāvartana, 361, 363.
Sāmaveda, 177, 179.
Sambandha marriages, 52, 377-378.
Saṁgha, 453.
Saṁkarṣaṇa, 74.
Saṁśaptakas, 192.
Samuccaya, 301.
Samudgaka, 423.
Samudra Banija Jātaka, 447.
Saṁudragṛha, 243.
Saṁvāda hymns, 175f.
Saṁvāhaka, 151f, 168.
Saṁvatsara, 450.
Saṁyattīnāvaḥ, 443.
Sandal, 389; -powder 411.
Sandhis, 43, 182f, 186.
Śāṇḍilya, 130n.
Sañjaya, 49f, 110.
Sankar, K. G., 2, 21, 26n, 28n ff, 34n, 51n f, 60n f, 63, 72n, 73, 75, 77n, 100n, 105, 108f, 112n, 155, 167n ff, 277n, 377.
Saṅkarṣaṇa, 101n, 143, 224f, 227, 432; -kathā 226.
Saṅketa, 431n.
Śaṅku, 414n, 416; -karṇa 214, 427.
Ṣāṇmātura, 425; Ṣaṇmukha, 425.
Sannyāsin, 360ff.
Sanskrit Drama (Keith), 40n, 67n, 77n, 84n f, 87n, 89n, 92n f, 105n f, 110n, 123n f, 126n f, 131n f, 134n, 137n ff, 143n, 145n, 175n ff, 194n, 209n, 219n, 263n, 271n, 275n, 290n, 304n f, 308n.
Sanskrit Drama and Dramatists (Kulkarni), 79n, 175n, 180n.
Sanskrit Grammar (Whitney), 61n.
śānti, 223, 226, 445; *śāntigṛha* 397; *Śāntiparvan*, 431.
Santuṣṭa, 43, 103, 238.
Sapiṇḍas, 366, 372, 376.

Sapatnīmardana, 467.
Saptacchada, 467.
saptapadī, 369, 373, 375.
Saptaparṇa, 466*f*.
Śara, 414*n*, 415, 467.
Śara, 274.
Śāradātanaya, 25, 27*ff*, 33, 70, 96, 131.
Sarais, 388*f*.
Śarajanman, 425.
Sarala, 435, 465*f*.
Sarasvatī, 328*f*, 344.
Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa, 152*f*, 459*n*.
Saraswati, A. Rangaswami, 49, 51, 56, 61*n*, 98*n*, 110*n*.
Śaravaṇabhava, 425.
Śarayu, 330, 340.
Śārdūlavikrīḍita, 144*f*.
Śāriputraprakaraṇa, 160.
Sarja, 435, 465*f*.
Sarma, Dr. Dasaratha, 75*n*.
Sarma, Dr. Har Dutt, 54.
Sarma, Ramavatara, 2, 61*n*, 155.
Sarma, Shivadatta, 97*n*, 112*n*, 114*n*.
Sarma, V. Venkatarama (=Sastri, V. Venkatarama) 3*n*, 24*n*, 43, 47, 167*n*; See also Sastri, V. Venkatarama.
Śārṅga, 185.
Śārṅgadharapaddhati, 44, 112, 115.
Sarpikā, 329.
Sarup, Dr. Lakshman, 1, 3*f*, 8*n f*, 12*n*, 19*n*, 22*f*, 28*ff*, 32*n*, 36, 39*n*, 44, 57*n*, 61*n*, 67*n*, 72*n*, 77*n*, 83, 86, 87*n*, 89, 91*n*, 97*n*, 106*n*, 110*n f*, 112 *ff*, 116*f*, 125, 132*n*, 134*n*, 219, 264*n*, 275*n*, 317, 325*n*, 341*n*, 364*n*, 398*n*, 434*n*.
Sarvānanda, 25, 29*f*, 33*f*, 70.
Śarvasvāra, 471.
Śarvilaka, 160, 164, 169, 299, 304, 306, 458.
Śaryāti, 210.
Sasandeha, 257*f*.
Śaṣṭhī, 159, 295.
Sastri, G. Harihara, 1, 26*n*, 29*n*, 34*f*, 52, 56, 101*n*, 155, 157, 170*n*, 174*n*, 461*n*.
Sastri, MM. Dr. Haraprasada, 1, 54, 61*n f*, 67, 69, 80, 100*n*, 122*n*, 126, 129*n f*, 421*n*.
Sastri, Dr. Hirananda, 2, 24*n*, 26*n*, 32*n*, 38*n*, 48*f*, 61*n*, 72*n*, 97*n f*, 111*n*, 127*n*, 152, 155, 163, 164*n*.
Sastri, Prof. A. R. Krishna, 1, 88.
Sastri, K. S. Ramaswami, 97*n*, 132*n*.
Sastri, Rangacharya Raddi, 2, 23*n*, 40*n*, 61*n*, 72*n*, 98*n*, 111, 155.
Sastri, MM. Dr. Shama, 77*n*, 319*f*.
Sastri, MM. Dr. S. Kuppuswami, 2, 25*f*, 45, 48*ff*, 52, 56, 75*n*, 77*n*, 124, 275*n*, 377*n*.
Sastri, S. Narayana, 3, 35*n*, 104*n*, 106*f*, 116.
Sastri, MM. Dr. T. Ganapati, 2*ff*, 17, 19, 23*f*, 26, 28*f*, 31*f*, 34*n*, 44, 47*n*, 51*n*, 53*ff*, 58*n*, 61*n*, 63, 66, 69*n*, 72, 74*ff*, 80, 82*f*, 91*n*, 97*n*, 98, 100*n*, 107*f*, 122*n*, 126, 128, 155, 166*n*, 170, 186*ff*, 193, 200, 209, 239*f*, 257, 268*n*, 272, 275*n*, 277, 307, 320*n*, 395*n*.
Sastri, V. Venkatarama, 73; See also Sarma, V. Venkatarama.
Śatānika, 337, 342.
Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, 327, 329, 331*n*, 334, 337, 342.
Śatapatra, 465.
Sātavāhana, 42.
Satī, 383-384.
Śātrajita Śatānika, 327.
Śatrughna, 53, 217, 254*f*, 338.
Saṭṭaka, 184.
Sātvatī, 194, 200, 210.
Satvin, 467.
Satya, 400.
Satyabhāmā, 467.
Saubhika, 178*f*.
Saudāminī, 234.
Śaumila, 165.
Saunders, Virginia, 132*n*, 135*n*.
Saurājya, 338.
Śaurasenī, 126*f*.
Saurasenoi, 338.
Saurāṣṭra, 323, 332, 338-339.
Sauvīra, 52, 67, 136, 323, 339, 354, 403, 407.

Sauvīrarāja, 230f, 235f, 376n, 444n.
Savarṇa, 370, 378.
Sāyaka, 414n.
Sāyaṇa, 468.
Śayyāti, 357.
Scented garment, 302.
School for Scandal, 291.
School of Oriental Studies, London, 84.
Schroeder, Dr. L. von 176, 179n.
Sculpture in Vedic, Indus and Buddhist period 420 ; -in Bhāsa 420-422.
Scythian, 384.
Sea-borne trade, 446.
Seals, Indus, 470.
Sea-Room, 283 ; sea voyage 445.
secret service, 236 ; Secret Service Deptt 405-407.
Seleucus Nicator, 100n, 343, 372.
Senādhyakṣa, 410.
Senānī, 425f.
Senāpati, 409.
Seoli, 467.
Śephālikā, 30f, 142, 281, 291, 467 ; *Śephālikānka* 58.
Servants' quarters, 393.
Sewell, Col. R., 437n.
Shakespeare, 21, 57f, 118, 132.
Shampooer, 295, 394, 448 ; shampooing 459.
Shawls, 446.
Sheeps, 438.
Shells, 409, 450; shell-workers 446.
Shembavanekar, Prof. K. M., 61n, 75n, 124n.
Sheridan, 291.
Sherring, M., 347.
Shields, 414f.
Ships, 443f, 446.
Shireff, A. G., 2.
shoes, 439.
Shopkeepers, 406.
Sialkot, 335.
Śibikā, 442ff.
Siddhilekhakas, 139.
Śikhariṇī, 144, 146.
Śilālī, 178.
silk, 439.
silver, 446, 451.
Simhala, 336.
Simhapañjara, 385.
Simhasena, 129.
Simile cf. battle with sacrifice, 416.
Simuka Āndhra, 165.
Sindha, 339, 342 ; Sindhu 67, 411 ; Sindhu-Sauvīra, 67.
Singhbhum, 333.
Singraur, 345.
Śiprā, R., 340, 391.
Śirastrāṇa, 416.
Sircars, 347.
Sirhind, 329.
Śirīṣa, 384.
Śiśunāga, 325, 334.
Sītā, 10, 11, 19, 46, 48, 53, 87, 89f, 113, 135f, 143, 213ff, 241ff, 246ff, 259f, 262, 303, 335, 379.
Sitabenga cave, 180.
Sitar, 423.
Śiva, 424ff ; Śiva temple 53, 420, 429 ; Śiva worship 424.
Śivathikā Smaśāna, 469.
Skanda, 425ff, 460 ; Skandaputras 460
skins, 446.
Slaughter-houses, 436, 438.
Slavery, 452-455 ; slaves, emancipation of 455 ; - female 455 ; -kinds of 454 ; -their duties 453.
Śleṣa, 166.
Śloka, 144ff.
Smaraṇa, 287.
Smith, Dr. V. A., 2, 3n, 62n, 76n, 78n, 88n, 100n, 320, 421n, 443.
Smṛtis, 310, 353, 372, 376, 381, 440, 451.
Snehodbhāvana, 157.
Śobhanikas, 178.
Social Life in Ancient India, 241n, 364n, 374n, 377n f, 382n f, 393n f, 397n, 423n, 439n, 441n, 460n.
Social Organisation in North-East India (Eng. Tr.) 319n, 357n, 359n, 447n, 453n f.
Sociological Conditions, 67-68 ; Book II.
Solecisms, 150.
Soma, 436.
Somadeva, 116.
Soman, K. L., 292 ; See also Kirāta
Some Problems of Indian Literature (Winternitz): See '*Problems*'

Soṇa, R., 343.
Song and dance, 227.
Sonpat, 329.
Sophir, 339.
Sources of revenue, 407.
South Africa, 391.
South Indian Dramas, 130.
spices, 446.
Spies, 406, 409, 412f.
Spinning, 445f.
Spooner, Dr. D., 451.
Śraddhā, 250.
śrāddha, 87, 250f, 254f, 260, 262, 369, 430.
Śrāddhakalpa, 63f, 250, 356; -(Prācetas) 356n.
Śragdharā, 144.
Śramaṇaka 79f; Śramaṇas 355.
Śrāvastī, 324, 330, 340.
Śreṇi, 408.
Śrī Harṣa, 91, 96; see also Harṣa
Śrīkaṇṭhadeśa, 329.
Śṛṅgāra, 93, 107, 182f, 186, 209, 226, 238, 272f, 287.
Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, 25, 27, 238.
Śṛṅgiverapura, 244, 323, 345.
Stables for horses, elephants etc, 412.
Stadium, 389, 440.
Staircases, 396.
Statuary, 420.
Statue-houses, 53-54, 71, 87, 100, 244f, 255, 259f, 262, 419-420, 429.
Statues-kept in statue-houses 421; -of dead kings in Bhāsa 420-421; -unknown in Kekaya 421.
Stein, Dr. M. A., 326.
Stein, Dr. Otto, 55, 319.
Sten Konow, Dr., See Konow, Dr. Sten.
sthāpaka, 40.
sthāpanā, 3, 6, 32, 39, 56, 157, 160.
sthitayantra, 415.
St. Nicholas, 392.
Stone, 449; Stone-forts 417; stone-statues 245.
Strabo, 469.
Studies in Ancient Hindu Polity, 77n, 320n, 386n, 443n.
Studies in Indian History and Culture, 320n.
Suali, Dr. L., 2, 61n.
Subandhu, 68n.
Subhadrādhanañjaya, 3, 38, 125.
Subhāṣitas, 93n, App.
Subhāṣitāvalī, 112, 115f.
Sucetanā, 237, 376n.
Sudarśana, 185, 188.
Sudarśanā, 236f, 376n, 445.
Sudās, 334.
Sudassana, 328.
Sudhā, 439.
Sudhākāra, 43, 244, 261.
Śūdraka, 47, 49, 51f, 54, 69f, 76, 80f, 99, 109f, 112, 145ff, 163ff, 168f, 171, 173, 265n, 277n, 288, 298, 300, 305ff, 471.
Śūdras, 177, 179, 350ff, 358ff, 369, 372f, 389, 431.
Sugṛhīta, 67, 464.
Sugrīva, 8, 89, 212f, 215, 218, 220, 252, 254f, 341; -kathā 218.
Suhma, 338.
Suicide, 471.
Śuka, 216.
Śūkarikā, 415.
Śukra, 404.
Sukthankar, Dr. V. S., 2, 4, 14, 17, 19n, 21n, 26n, 29n, 30ff, 35n, 39f, 57, 61n, 64, 98n, 103n, 111n, 123, 125ff, 134f, 143n, 146n, 151ff, 155f, 159n, quoted 160-163; 166n, 179n, 220n, 289, 310n, 416n.
Śuktimuktāvalī, 34, 36, 112, 114f.
Śūla, 414n, 415.
śulka, 373.
sumanāvaṇṇaa, 14.
Sumantra, 8, 46, 143, 241n, 244, 246ff, 252f, 255f, 261.
Śumbha, 348.
Sumer, 446.
Sumeru, 347f.
Sumitrā, 237, 243, 246, 252, 254, 373f, 376n.
Summer-house, 397, 419.
Sun, 426.
Śunaḥśepākhyāna, 84, 203.
Śuṅga, 99; Śuṅga Puṣyamitra 69
Suparṇādhyāya, 176.
Superintendent of chariots, 411; -commerce 448; -elephants 411;

-gambling 457 ; -horses 411 ; -mint 452 ; -prostitutes 459.
Suppāraka Jātaka, 447.
Śūra, 338.
Surā, 437.
Śurasena, 323, 338, 343.
Surāṣṭra, 67.
Surat, 339.
Surgeons, 409.
Surundhana, 328.
Sūrya, 424.
Suṣira, 423.
śuśrūṣā, 71.
Sūtradhāra, 5, 32, 37, 39*f*, 42, 44, 96-98, 109, 157, 160, 167, *&c.*
Suvadanā, 16, 154.
Suvarṇa, 79, 167, 449, 451*f*.
Suvarṇagiri, 344.
Suvarṇarucira, 146n.
Suvela, 215, 323, 348*f*.
Svabhāvokti, 218, 258, 287, 293.
Svāhā, 425 ; Svāheya 425.
Svāmin, 101.
Svapnanī Sundarī (= *Svapnavāsavadatta* by Dhruva) 5n, 41n, 69n, 99n f, 104n, 118n, 150n, 153n, 241n, 273n, 306n, 434n, 470n.
Svapnavāsavadatta, 2ff, 9*f*, 14ff, 23ff, 41ff, 49, 51, 56*f*, 62, 67*f*, 71*f*, 75, 82ff, sources 87-88 ; 90, 92*f*, 98, 103, 105, 108*f*, 111, 113, 116, 118, table 119 ; 120, 122, 139, staging of IV Act 142 ; 144ff, 150, 167, 172n, 197, 229, 238, 273, 275, title 277; plot 278-286 ; deviations 286-287 ; type 287 ; sentiments 287-288 ; critical remarks 288-293 ; 301n, 303*f*, *Svapna* and *Cār* 307n ; 309n, 310, 340*f*, 349n, 363n ff, 373n ff, 377n ff, 382n *f*, 386n, 391n, 401, 404n, 422n, 434n f, 462 ff, 467n *f*, 472n.
Svapnavāsavadatta (Bhide), 5n, 62n, 67n, 69n, 168n, 339n.
Svapnavāsavadatta, (Dhruva) See *Svapnanī Sundarī*
Svapnavāsavadatta (Ray) 41n, 277n.
Svapnavāsavadatta upar navo prakāś, 26n, 28n, 31n ff, 39n.
Svarājya, 20.
Svātt, 130n.
Svayaṁvara, 371.
Śvetāmbara, 80.
Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, 425.
Swami, Bhattanatha, 2, 23, 25n f, 29, 35n, 110n, 152, 155, 159, 164n, 173.
Swat, 331.
Swine, 438.
Swords, 414.
Syāmala, 112, 115.
Syandikā, 329.
Syrastreno, 338.
Tabard, Fr., 264n.
Table, 119 ; tables 417.
Tadguṇa, 257.
Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, 363n ; *Taitt. Saṁhitā* 428.
Takṣaśilā, 331.
Tāla, 470.
Tāli, 384, 470 ; tālipatra 104*f* ; tālipatta 173, 470.
Tāmraparṇī, 78, 336, 347.
taṇḍulā, 438.
Tanks, 419, 429.
Tantravārtika, 68n, 77.
tapas, 432 ; Tāpasa 364.
Tāpasavatsarāja, 149, 288.
Tāpasī, 364.
Tapatīsaṁvarana, 3, 38, 125.
tapovana, 147, 263.
Tārā, 213, 378.
Tārakajit, 426 ; Tārakāsura 425.
tata, 423.
Tatke, Prof. S. B., 6n, 61n, 86n, 155, 238n.
Tatpuruṣa, 96.
Tavern keeper, 391.
Taxila, 331, 469.
Telavāhā, 333.
Telingiri, 333.
Tempest, 188.
Temples, 417*f*, 428*f*.
Terminalia, 466 ; Terminalia Tomentosa 466.
Thakkar Vassanji Madhavji Lectures (Dhruva), 5n, 21n, 75n, 120n, 124n, 145n.
Thanesar, 328*f*.
Theft and robbery in *Ṛgveda* 460 ; -in *Arthaśāstra* 461.
Thieves, 392.

Thirteen Trivandrum Plays (Woolner and Sarup) 5n, 20n f, 86n, 97n, 188n, 196n, 208n, 212n, 219n, 226n f, 275n, 290n, 300n, 303n, 329n, 375n, 398n, 465n.
Thomas, Dr. F. W., 2, 4, 24n, 26n, 30n, 32, 39n, 44f, 52, 55, 57n f, 64, 77n, 83n, 112f, 115, 117, 123, 128, 155, 157, 275n, 308n, 317n, 320.
Throwing sand in the enclosures, 421.
Tibet, 326.
tides, 434.
Tīkṣṇa, 406.
Tilak, Lok. B. G., 316n, 317.
Timetable for the king, 398-399.
Tinnevelly, 78, 347.
tippler, 438.
Tirhut, 334f.
Tiruvanchikulam, 53.
tithis, 434; *tithi*-scheme 103, 159f, 162.
Tivar, 466.
Toilet, 382f.
Tomara, 414n, 415.
Torch-bearers, 401.
tortoise, 437.
tournaments, 441.
Trade and Industry, 445-448; -in *Ṛgveda*, Indus period, epics, *Jātakas* and Mauryan age 445-448; -in Bhāsa 448.
traders, 445; trade, various kinds of 447.
Tragic in Bhāsa, 132-135.
training daily for the army, 412.
Trāivikrama, 3n, 38, 108f, 149.
Transverse curtain, 221.
trāsi, 415; *trāsika* 414n, 415.
Travancore hills, 347.
Tretāyuga, 45, 47.
Trident, 415.
Trikoṭa, 346.
Trikūṭa, 323, 346, 390.
Trippunithura Sanskrit College (MSS) 216.
Triśūla, 415.
Trivikrama, 112.
Troṭaka, 184.
trumpets, 296.
truṭi, 450.
tryasra, 138.
tuha, 127.
tumam, 17, 158.
Tungabhadrā, 341.
Turfan MSS., 124, 158, 160.
turtle, 437.
tuvam, 17.
Types of Sanskrit Drama, 180-184.
Types of Sanskrit Drama, (Mankad) 175n, 182n, 187n, 194n, 200n, 203n, 209n, 272n, 300n.
Udāttarāghava, 3, 35, 106.
Udaya, 343f.
Udayana Vatsarāja, 264ff, 274ff, 280ff, 306, 325, 337, 342, 373f, 398n, 405n, 410, 422, 468; See also Vatsarāja.
Udayana legend, 264, 270, 288.
Udayanācārya, 35.
Udayāśva, 342, 344.
Udāyī, 69.
uddehi, 158.
Udyāmaka, 323, 348.
Ugrasena, 20, 69, 80, 143, 225.
Ujjain, 294f, 302, 306; See also Ujjayinī.
Ujjayinī, 113, 136, 266, 268, 275, 280, 283, 285, 324f, 340-341, 387, 391, 429, 434, 447.
Ullekha, 218, 302.
Umaji Naik, 461.
Underground drains, 388f, 391.
Unmādavāsavadatta, 49f, 73, 110, 149, 288.
Unmattaka, 126n.
Unmattopāsaka, 430.
Upagoḍa, 452.
Upajāti, 144f.
Upakathānaka, 300.
Upamā, 93, 218, 259, 274, 287f, 293, 300ff.
Upanayana, 361.
Upaniṣads, 178, 424f, 433.
Upaplavya, 335.
Upasaṁhāra (in Marathi) 62n, 79n, 318, 322n, 324n, 328n, 350n, 369n f, 385n, 427n f, 431n, 442n.
Upasthānagṛha, 233, 397.
Upavīta, 439.
Upendravajrā, 204.
Upper Doab, 328.

Ur, 446.
Urdhwareshe, Prof. W. G., 289n.
Ūrubhaṅga, 2f, 5ff, 12, 14ff, 19f, 22, 57, 68n, 84, sources 85-86; 92, 95, table 119; 120, 129, tragedy 132-134; 144, 146, 187, title 195; plot 195-199; deviations 199; type 199-200; sentiments 200; critical remarks 200-201; 205, 220, 227, 229, 329, 375n, 383n, 386n, 400n, 410n f, 413n f, 416n, 422n, 433n, 434.
Ūrubhaṅga (Weller), 134n.
Uṣas, 367.
Usury, 445.
Utpala, 465.
Utpalāpīḍa, 225.
Utprekṣā, 93, 218, 238, 258, 288, 293, 302.
Utsṛṣṭikāṅka, 134f, def. 190; 192, 194, 200.
Uttara, 206ff, 211, 411, 413.
Uttarā, 86, 207f, 267.
Uttarādhyayanasūtra, 341.
Uttarakuru, 322, 325-326, 348.
Uttararāmacarita, 27, 70, 145, 148.
Uttarā Vaitālikā, 382n.
Uttarīya, 384, 439.
Vadhū, 377; *vadhūḥ* 173, 300; vadhūyāna 444.
vaha, 449.
Vaidehī, 244, 256; Vaidehīputra 337.
Vaidya, C. V., 62n, 75n, 79n, 318, 322n, 324n, 328, 350, 369f, 384f, 409n, 427n f, 431n, 442n, 458n, 460n.
Vaijayanta, 426.
Vainagaṅgā, 332.
Vairantya, 234, 236, 323, 328, 345, 387, 390.
Vairat, 345.
Vaiśālī, 401, 428.
Vaiṣṇava, 105, 308; Vaiṣṇavism 424, 426f.
Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, Etc, 86n.
Vaiśravaṇa, 426.
Vaiśvadevī, 144.
Vaiśyas, 177, 350ff, 357-358, 360, 389.
Vaitālīya, 146.
Vaitaraṇī, 332.
Vājasaneyī Saṁhitā, 428.
Vajjis, 334, 342.
Vajrabāhu, 223.
Vākpatirāja, 42, 44, 47.
Valabhī, 339.
Vālin, 6, 12, 18, 89, 213f, 219f, 252, 341.
valkala incident 147; *valkalas* 53, 147, 242, 255, 257f, 260, 439.
Vālmīki, 331.
Vālukātīrtha, 348.
Vāmadeva, 53, 247, 253f, 347.
Vāmana, 71-72, 166f, 309, 311, 426.
Vāmana Purāṇa, 347.
Vaṁśa, 423, 467.
Vaṁśa Brāhmaṇa, 327.
Vaṁśas, 337, 341.
Vaṁśastha, 144f.
Vaṅga, 323, 336f.
Vaṇik, 299, 353n.
Vānaprastha, 360, 362.
Vānaras, 213, 215f.
vara, 377.
Varāha, 426.
Varāhakarṇa, 414n, 415.
Varāhamihira, 336.
Varāha Purāṇa, 346.
Vararuci, 126n, 342.
vārī, 449.
Varma, 416.
Varṇa, 350; Varṇāśramadharma 317.
varṣa, 450.
Varuṇa, 215, 218f, 221, 424, 428.
Vasantaka, 43, 268f, 283f, 286f.
Vasantasenā, 11, 142, 152f, 160, 164, 168, 294ff, 302ff, 307n, 373, 422, 459n.
Vasantatilaka, 144f.
Vaśas, 337.
Vāsavadattā, 7, 23, 25f, 29f, 49f, 52, 90, 110, 113, 142, 264f, 267ff, 271f, 276ff, 288ff, 307n, 325, 337, 373ff, 377f, 382n, 404, 422.
Vāsavadattā (Paris) 129n.
Vasiṣṭha, 53, 242, 247, 253f, 367f.
Vasu, 333.
Vasudāna, 337.

Vasudeva, 102, 143, 221ff, 225, 228, 338.
Vāsudeva, 136, 426; Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa 401, 426, 431f.
Vāsuki, 346.
Vatica Robusta, 466.
Vatsa, 130n, 323, 337f, 341f, 348f; -kingdom 278, 284, 286, 292, 404.
Vatsala, 92f, 203, 210.
Vatsarāja, 10f, 50, 373, 379, 401, 404, 406, 422, 444, 471; See also Udayana.
Vatsarājacarita, 51, 109f, 149, 166, 255n, 277, 288.
Vātsyāyana, 78, 89, 241, 364, 374, 376ff, 392f, 397, 422, 438, 460.
Vāyu Purāṇa, 338, 342.
Vedāṅgas, 356; Vedas 63, 250, 356, 432.
Vedic Aryan, 387, 440.
Vedische Studien, 458n.
Vedic Worship, 424.
Vegetables, kitchen, 393.
Veṇīsaṁhāra, 133n, 134, 148, 200, 260.
Venkataraman, T. L., 62n, 99n.
Venkatarama Sarma, V., 83f, 97n, 108n; See also Sarma, V. Venkatarama and Sastri, V. Venkatarama.
Venkatasubbiah, Dr. A., 89.
Venkateśvara, Prof. S. V., 132n, 316n f, 363, 382n f, 398n, 402n f, 405n, 410, 439n, 469n.
Veṇu, 415.
Veṇuvana, 63, 265, 323, 344n, 348; -vihāra 344.
Veraval, 339.
Verses, Split-up, 16, App.
Verses and Dialogues, 119-122.
Veśyā, 299.
Vibhāva, 92, 183.
Vibhāvanā, 287.
Vicissitudes of Aryan Civilization, 428n.
Vidarbha, 332f.
Videha, 323, 329, 335ff, 401, 447.
Vidiśā, 333.
vidrava, 182.
Viḍūḍabha, 325, 330.
Vidura, 195.
Vidūṣaka, 26, 28, 90, 113, 141f, 171f, 179, 231f, 234f, 238, 268f, 281ff, 307n; -kathā 238.
Vidyabhushan, MM. S. C., 65.
Vidyādhara, 94, 135, 148, 217, 219, 234, 238, 331, 407, 441.
Vihāras, 431.
Vijayā, 16, 251, 336.
Vijayanagara, 341.
Vikramāditya, 51, 75n, 112, 124, 325,
Vikramorvaśīya, 3, 40, 96, 258.
Vikṛṣṭa, 137.
Vilāsinī, 10, 232.
Vimalā, 189.
Vimarśa, 182, 186.
Viṇā, 423.
Viṇāvāsavadatta, 49ff, 73, 83, 110, 149, 170.
Vinaya Texts, 323n.
Vindhya, 69, 98, 173, 323, 332, 346, 348; -vāsinī 348.
Vīra, 92, 182f, 187, 190, 194, 200, 203f, 210, 218, 226, 273.
Vīranāga, 70.
Virāṭa, 205ff, 334f, 411, 468.
Virāṭanagara, 323, 335, 345.
Virodhābhāsa, 114, 204, 210, 287, 301.
Viśākha, 425, 429.
Viśākhadatta, 38, 145.
Viṣama, 287.
Viśeṣokti, 287.
Vision of Vāsavadattā, 3n f, 8n f, 12n, 19n, 24n, 28n ff, 32n, 36n, 39n, 44n, 57n, 62n, 72n, 77n, 91n, 97n, 106n, 110n f, 113n f, 116n, 125n, 264n, 325n, 341n, 364n, 434n.
vismita, 14, 292.
Viṣṇu, 17, 201, 219, 223f, 226, 424ff, 432, 470; -temple 53.
Viṣṇudharmottara, 107f.
Viṣṇu Purāṇa, 54, 86.
Viṣṇusena, 229, 235f.
Viṣṇusmṛti, 359n.
Viśvanātha, 39f, 74, 96f, 259.
Viśvasimha, 99.
Viswanatha, Prof. S. V., 317, 352, 373n, 384, 408, 414n.
Viṭa, 152f, 184, 238, 294f, 300, 302, 459.

Vitahavyas, 327.
Vitasti, 449.
Vithi, 180f, def. 186, 187.
Vizagapatam, 332.
vratas, 382.
Vṛṣabhadatta, 16.
Vṛṣalipati, 369.
Vṛṣṇis, 432.
Vṛttis, 43, 182f.
vucchianti, 157.
Vyadīsaṁgraha, 307.
Vyājokti, 71.
vyapaśri, 14.
Vyāsa, 107f, 136, 195f.
Vyāyoga, 180ff, 184, def. 186, 187, 190, 194, 200, 203, 209.
Waddell, Lt. Col. L. A., 316n, 343.
walled cities, 417.
Walsh, 451.
War, 400; -minister 410; -ornament of elephant 410.
Wardha (R.), 333.
Washermen, 443.
Watch-towers, 412.
Water on stage, 18-19, 236, 248, 283.
Water roures, 443; water supply 443; water worship 417.
Weapons, 414-416, 446; -defensive 414-415; -offensive 414-415; -of Kṛṣṇa 427.
Weaving, 423, 445, 448.
Weber, Dr. A., 178n f, 316n, 351.
Weights and Measures in *Arthaśāstra*, 448-450.
Well, 417, 419.
Weller, Dr. H., 2, 5, 44, 61n, 75n, 83, 86, 89, 105n, 112ff, 126n, 134, 226n, 308, 398n.
Western Ghats, 347.
Westminster, 340.
Wheat, 436ff.
Whitney, Prof. W. D., 61n.
Widows, 383f.
Wilde, Oscar, 8, 276.
Wilson, Prof. H. H., 140, 305.
Wilson Philological Lectures, 126n.
Windisch, 175, 305.
Winternitz, Dr. M., 2ff, 6n f, 13, 15n, 16, 18n ff, 30n, 38n, 42, 48n, 55n, 57f, 61n, 64n f, 76n, 79, 84ff, 97n ff, 110f, 123, 132ff, 155, 164n, 169, 172n f, 175n f, 187, 190f, 194f, 200, 209, 211, 219, 226f, 238, 263, 271, 305n, 316ff, 360n, 401n, 458, 463n, 468.
Winter's Tale, 227, 291.
Women, dress of, 384; -ornaments 384.
Wonder, 300.
Woollen fabrics, 446.
Woolley, Sir Leonard, 317n.
Woolner, Dr. A. C., 2, 5, 21, 126n, 208, 212, 219, 227, 275, 398n.
Woolner, Dr. A. C., and Sarup, Dr. L., 20n, 86n, 97n, 188, 196n, 226n, 290n, 300n, 303n, 329n, 375n, 398n, 465n.
Wordsworth, W., 113.
Worship, Vedic., 424.
Wounds in war as ornaments, 400.
Wrestling, 441; -bout 440.
Writing, 470.
Writs, 399.
Yādava, 338.
Yadu, 338, 340.
Yāga, 471.
Yajña, 400.
Yājñavalkya, 457.
Yajñopavita, 354.
Yajurveda, 177, 179.
Yakṣiṇī, 426f.
Yama, 251.
Yamakas, 19, 107, 221, 228.
Yamala, 223.
Yamnotrī, 346.
Yamuna, 323, 341, 343f.
Yānas, 442.
Yaśastilaka, 114.
Yaśodā, 222, 426f.
Yaugandharāyaṇa, 18, 32, 49f, 52, 90, 104, 136, 148, 265f, 268ff, 272, 274ff, 278f, 285f, 306, 364, 404, 406f, 445.
Yava, 449.
Yavanikā, 14, 66, 139.
Yayāti, 210.
Yogācaryā, 169, 460.
Yogamāyā, 344, 348, 426.
Yoganidrā, 305n.
Yogaroçanā, 460.
Yogaśāstra, 63, 65, 250, 356; -of Maheśvara 356n.

Yojana, 450.
Yudhiṣṭhira, 206, 208, 210, 218, 273, 456, 468.
Yūka, 449.
Yūpagrāma, 323, 348.
Zenana System, 385.
Zimmer, H. 351.
Zimmermann, Dr. R., 316.
zinc, 446.
Zodiac, 79, 434.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

(Note :—Corrections requiring insertion or omission of diacritical marks are not included in the following list.)

P.	9	l.	35	*for* 'suiters' *read* 'suitors'
P.	13	l.	27	Insert footnote '5' after 'them'
P.	19	l.	19	Delete full point after 'descriptions'
P.	21	fn.	3	After 'See above', Add 'p. 3 and notes 2–4.'
P.	34	fn.	5	*for* 'सा' *read* 'त्या'
P.	36	l.	7	Put a comma after '*Kavivimarśa*.'
P.	40	l.	23	Delete the dash after 'temples'.
P.	47	fn.	3	Add: "cf. 'One Bhāsa Verse and its bearing on the Bhāsa Problem', by A. D. Pusalker, *IC*, IV, pp. 522-525."
P.	53	l.	last	Insert fn no. '4' before '*Pratimā*'
P.	54	l.	2	Insert inverted commas before 'is'
P.	55	l.	3	*for* 'was not existing' *read* 'did not exist'
P.	55	ll.	14-15	*for* 'are quite...since...' *read* 'have been...during...'
P.	55	l.	23	*for* 'Indoligica' *read* 'Indologica'
P.	61	fn.	1	*for* 'Leśny' *read* 'Losný'
P.	62	fn.	1	Add '1913' after '*JASB*'
P.	66	l.	33	*for* 'problem selswhere' *read* 'problems elsewhere'
P.	66	fn.	3	Delete '18'
P.	70	fn.	1	Add : "The same has now appeared in *JAHRS*, XI, pp. 33–42; also in the Proceedings and Transactions of the Ninth All-India Oriental Conference, Trivandrum, Pub. 1940, pp. 436-444."
P.	79	l.	20	Put a comma after 'origin'
P.	80	l.	2	*for* 'ध्दण' *read* 'धदेण'
P.	82	last		Put a full stop instead of the comma after 'land'
P.	84	fn.	1	Add: "Dr. R. L. Turner also informs me that there are no Bhāsa MSS in the School of Oriental Studies, London."
P.	86	l.	16	Delete 'news'
P.	88	fn.	1	*for* 'Dec' (in l. 2) *read* 'Deb'
P.	93	fn.	3	*for* 'subhāṣita as' *read* 'subhāṣitas'
P.	94	last		*for* 'lightening' *read* 'lightning'

P. 98	fn.	3	Delete full stop after 'Ter'
P. 98	fn.	3	*for* 'Narasinhavaraman' *read* 'Narasimhavarman'
P. 105	1.	3	*for* 'श्रीमात्रा ⋯' *read* 'श्रीमत्रा ⋯'
P. 122	1.	4	from below *for* 'Lesny' *read* 'Lesný'
P. 128	1.	12	*for* 'form' *read* 'from'
P. 131	1.	23	Complete the inverted commas after 'Prasasti'
P. 132	1.	7	*for* 'unoften' *read* 'seldom'
P. 133	1.	3	*for* 'though' *read* 'but'
P. 133	fn.	3	Delete '59'
P. 134	1.	16	Put footnote no. '3' after 'scene'; delete footnote no. '3' after 'tragedy' in the same line.
P. 137	fn.	4	*for* 'articles' *read* 'article'
P. 154	1.	16	*for* 'latter' *read* 'later'
P. 156	1.	37	*for* 'rendered' *read* 'render'
P. 165	fn.	1	Add: "It has been published in *JAHRS*, XI, pp. 33-42; also in Proc. and Trans. of IXth All-India Oriental Conference, Trivandrum, pp. 436-444."
P. 166	1.	18	*for* 'one' *read* 'occurs'
P. 168	1.	34	*for* 'and, in' *read* 'and, as in'
P. 175	fn.	1	*for* 'Dramtists' *read* 'Dramatists'
P. 178	fn.	1	*for* 'Levi' *read* 'Lévi'
P. 190	1.	23	Delete the second (
P. 193	1.	24	*for* 'returns' *read* 'retorts'
P. 202	1.	9	*for* 'Madhyma' *read* 'Madhyama'
P. 218	1.	32	Delete the question mark.
P. 220	fn.	2	Complete the bracket after 'साधयामि'
P. 230	1.	41	*for* 'suiters' *read* 'suitors'
P. 240	1.	19	Insert 'p.' before '107'
P. 241	fn.	2	*for* 'Sumitrā' *read* 'Sumantra'
P. 241	fn.	3	*for* 'p. 43 No. 41' *read* 'p. 43 n41'
P. 279	1.	26	*for* 'minister's' *read* 'ministers'
P. 285	1.	24	*for* 'patrait' *read* 'portrait'
P. 285	1.	42	*for* ladies *read* ladies'
P. 288	1.	25	*for* 'Mādyrāja' *read* 'Māyūrāja'
P. 295	1.	25	*for* 'astmī' *read* 'aṣṭamī'
P. 295	1.	41	*for* 'present' *read* 'the time'
P. 297	1.	18	*for* 'amok' *read* 'amuck'
P. 297	1.	41	*for* 'a while' *read* 'awhile'
P. 305	1.	5	Insert footnote no. '1' after 'days'
P. 307	fn.	1	Add: 'It has now been published, *JAHRS*, XI, pp. 33-42; also, Proc. and Trans. IXth All-Ind. Or. Con., Trivandrum, pp. 436-444.'
P. 310	fn.	3	*for* '1555' *read* '155'
P. 311	1.	14	*for* 'Patna' *read* 'Patan'
P. 317	fn.	2, 5	*for* 'Fabri' *read* 'Fábri'
P. 324	fn.	5	Add: 'Mr. K. M. Munshi, however, locates Māhiṣmatī near modern Broach.-Bhāratiya Vidyā, I, p. 81.'

P. 325	fn.	4	*for* 'XIII. 54-4-19' *read* 'XIII. 5. 4. 19'
P. 328	4.	33	*for* 'Samawati' *read* 'Sarasvati'
P. 328	1.	36	Put a comma after 'Kauśiki'
P. 329	1.	16	Insert footnote no. '2' after 'race'
P. 334	1.	24	*for* 'Sudāsa' *read* 'Sudās'
P. 339	1.	16	*for* 'Indrajit' *read* 'Indrajī'
P. 348	1.	8	*for* 'Mukteśwara' *read* 'Muktesvara'
P. 371	1.	24	Put a comma after 'bigamy'
P. 378	1.	22	Put a comma instead of a full stop after 'Pratimā'
P. 383	1.	17	Put a comma instead of a full stop after 'cultured'
P. 384	2nd Para.		Insert footnote 2, and in the footnote, add: "Prof. P. K. Gode of the Bhandarkar Institute, Poona, in an illuminating article entitled "The Antiquity of the Hindu Nose-Ornament called *Nath*." (*ABI*, XIX, pp. 318-332) has proved that the references to the nose-ornament go back only upto the 10th century."
P. 405	fn.	2	*for* 'Dikshiter' *read* 'Dikshitar'
P. 421	1.	25	*for* 'on the similarity' *read* 'on account of the similarity'
P. 424	11.	19-22	Insert footnote 1, and in the footnote, add: 'Dr. Radhakumud Mookerji has shown actual references to Śiva in the *Ṛgveda*. Cf. Proc. & Trans. of VIIIth Or. Con. Mysore, p. 452.'
P. 433	fn.	3	Add: "Prof. Gode of the Bhandarkar Institute informs me that there is no MS entitled *Hastiśikṣā* though Aufrecht records numerous MSS on Veterinary science which begin with Hasti or Aśva."
P. 438	1.	8	*for* 'offered' *read* 'offered'
P. 443	fn.	2	*for* '*Part*' *read* '*Pry*'
P. 446	1.	1	*for* 'firs' *read* 'furs'

Appendix I.

(A) Add: Prof. C. R. Devdhar has followed his one-volume text of Bhāsa with the annotated editions, including text and English translation of *Pratijñā*, *Cārudatta*, etc; the whole cycle will be complete before long.

(B) Add:

Bhattacharyya, Asoke Kumar

A Comparative Study of Bhāsa and Kālidāsa. *IC*, VI, pp. 83-93.

Karmarkar, R. D.

The Authorship and Date of the *Mrcchakaṭika*, *New Ind. Ant.*, II, pp. 76-85.

Pusalker, A. D.

Authorship and Date of the *Mrcchakaṭika*. *JAHRS*, XI, pp. 33-42; also, Proc. & Trans. of IXth All-India Or. Con., Trivandrum, Pub. 1940, pp. 436-444 Bhāsa and Kautilya's *Arthaśāstra*. Prof. K. V. Rangaswami Commemoration Volume, 1940, pp. 87-94.

Sastry, N. Sivarama.

Problems and Passages in the *Cārudatta*. Proc. & Trans. of IXth All-India Or. Conf., Trivandrum, Pub. 1940, pp. 445-470.

Appendix V. P. 28, l. 30. Add at the end : "No. 18 is from Somadeva's *Yaśastilaka*, Part II, p. 113, Nirnayasagara edn, 1903. The reference could not be included earlier as the book was not available to us. Mr. K. G. Sankar of the Imperial Library, Calcutta was kind enough to copy down and send the reference to us, for which we are deeply indebted to him."

Appendix V, p. 29. Add towards the end: "(13) तथा-उर्व-भारवि-भवभूति-भर्तृहरि-भर्तृमेण्ठ-कण्ठ-गुणाढ्य-व्यास-भास-बोस-कालिदास-बाण-मयूर-नारायण-कुमार-माघ-राजशेखरादि-महाकविकाव्येषु तत्र तत्रावसरे भरतप्रणीते काव्याध्याये सर्वजनप्रसिद्धेषु तेषूपाख्यानेषु च कर्म तद्विषया महती प्रसिद्धिः ।

MEHAR CHAND LACHHMAN DAS
SANSKRIT AND PRAKRIT SERIES.

1 *Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha-Saṃhitā*, (कपिष्ठलकठसंहिता) a text of the Black Yajur Veda, critically edited for the first time by Dr. Raghu Vira. Rs. 30/- or Sh. 45/-

2 *Vārāha-Śrauta Sūtra*, (वाराहश्रौतसूत्र) being the main ritualistic Sūtra of the Maitrāyaṇī Śākhā, critically edited for the first time with Mantra Index by the late Dr. W. Caland and Dr. Raghu Vira. Rs. 12/- or Sh. 18/-

3 *Ṛktantra*, (ऋक्तन्त्र), a prātiśākhya of the Sāma-Veda, critically edited with an Introduction, Exhaustive Notes, Appendices, a Commentary and Sāmaveda-sarvānukramaṇī by Dr. Sūryakānta, M. A., M. O. L., D. Litt., Shastri. The notes contain a detailed comparison with the other Prātiśākhyas and Pāṇini. Burnell's edition has been much improved upon with the help of new Mss. Rs. 20/- or Sh. 30/-

4 *Atharva Veda of the Paippalādas*. Books 1–13 पैप्पलाद-संहिता critically edited into Devanāgarī for the first time by Prof. Raghu Vira, M. A., Ph. D., D. Litt., et. Phil. Rs. 30/- or Sh. 45/-

5 *Jain Siddhānta Kaumudi* (जैनसिद्धान्तकौमुदी) or A Grammar of the Ardha Māgadhi Prākrit by His Holiness Śatāvadhāni Rattan Chand ji Jain Muni. 1938. Rs. 15/- or Sh. 22. 6d.

6 *Atharva Prātiśākhya*, (अथर्वप्रातिशाख्य), an entirely new and unique acquisition to the Vedic Literature critically edited for the first time by Dr. Sūryakānta, M. A., M. O. L., D. Litt., D. Phil., Shastri. 1939. Price Rs. 50/- or Sh. 75/-

7 *Bhāsa—A Study* by A. D. Pusalker, M. A., LL. B. A critical and exhaustive exposition of the baffling and still unsolved problem of Bhāsa's authorship of Trivandrum plays. 1940. Rs. 15/- or Sh. 22/6

8 *Woolner Commemoration Volume.* It is a magnificent collection of more than fifty invaluable articles on various aspects of Oriental languages and literatures contributed by the friends, pupils and colleagues from all over the world of the late Dr. Woolner, in whose commemoration the Volume has been prepared. If anything, it is a thesaurus of freshest research works in the field of Oriental languages and literatures; and is extremely thought-provoking. Rs. 30/- or Sh. 45.

9 *Elements of Hindu Culture and Sanskrit Civilization* by Dr. P. K. Acharya, M. A., Ph. D., D. Litt., Head of the Sanskrit Department, Allahabad University. 1939. Re. 1/8- or Sh. 2/6

10 *Nidāna Sūtra,* (निदानसूत्र) of Patañjali, edited for the first time together with an introduction, a fragmentary Commentary and Indices by Professor Kailash Nath Bhatnagar, M. A.

Rs. 25/-or Sh. 37/6

11 *Laghuṛktantra Saṃgraha and Sāma-Saptalakṣaṇa,* Edited for the first time with Commentary, Notes, Introduction, embodying a complete history of the nomenclative Grammatical Literature and Indices by Dr. Sūrya Kānta, M. A., M. O. L., D. Litt., D. Phil., Reader in Sanskrit, University of the Panjab. Rs. 16/- or Sh. 24/-

Apply to :—

MEHAR CHAND LACHHMAN DAS
PROP: THE SANSKRIT BOOK DEPOT,
Oriental & Foreign Booksellers & Publishers,
Jain Street, Saidmitha Bazar, LAHORE.

891.2052
Sanskrit Literature
Bhasa — Natak
Stu Tex

Dramas
Sanskrit Lit — Dramas
— Nāṭaka
&
Criticism — Bhāsa



Archaeological Library

Call No. 891.22/C/Bhe/Pan

Author— (Bhagwan Singh)

Title— Bhasa - A Study

Borrower No.	Date of Issue	Date of Return

"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book clean and moving.

S. B., 148, N. DELHI.